arXiv:1405.7737v1 [math.DS] 29 May 2014

LOCAL RIGIDITY OF HIGHER RANK NON-ABELIAN ACTION ON TOURS

ZHENQI JENNY WANG

Abstract. In this paper, we show local smooth rigidity for higher rank ergodic nilpotent action by toral automorphisms and prove the existence of such action on any torus $\mathbb{T}^N$ for any even $N \geq 6$. We also give examples of smooth rigidity of actions having rank-one factors. The method is a generalization of the KAM (Kolmogorov-Arnold-Moser) iterative scheme.

1. Introduction and main result

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finitely generated group and $\alpha : \mathcal{H} \to GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ be a homomorphism, where $GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ is the group of integer $N \times N$ matrices with determinant ± 1. Then α induces a natural action on $\mathbb{T}^N$ by automorphism. We say that action α is a *higher rank ergodic action* if $\alpha(\mathcal{H})$ contains two ergodic elements A, B such that $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ is ergodic if $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash 0$.

Definition 1.1. The action α of $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{T}^N$ is $C^{k,r,\ell}$ *locally rigid* if any C^k perturbation $\tilde{\alpha}$ which is sufficiently C^r close to α on a compact generating set is C^ℓ conjugate to α.

In contrast to the structural stability (C^0 rigidity) of diffeomorphisms and flows in hyperbolic dynamics, where differentiable rigidity is mostly like impossible, the presence of a large group action frequently allows one to improve the regularity of the conjugacy. The study of local differentiable rigidity of group actions has had two primary progresses, one from higher rank abelian action, see [2], [3], [4], [6], [7], [8]; the other from lattice in a semisimple Lie group, see [5].

The most general condition in the setting of $\mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{R}^l$ $k + l \geq 2$, actions, which leads to various rigidity phenomena (cocycle rigidity, local differentiable rigidity, measure rigidity, etc.), is the following:
($\mathfrak{R}$) the group $\mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{R}^l$ contains a subgroup S isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}^2$ such that every element other than identity acts ergodically with respect to the standard invariant measure obtained from Haar measure.

After noticing this condition, one can pass to the $\mathbb{Z}^2$ sub-action to establish the smooth conjugacy and then show that the conjugacy obtained also conjugates the other elements in $\mathbb{Z}^k \times \mathbb{R}^l$.

[0]The author is supported by NSF grants DMS-1346876.
2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 22E46, 22E50, Secondary 22D10, 22E30, 22E35.

A lattice in a connected semisimple Lie group G of non-compact type is "large" in the following sense: its Zariski closure is G. The rigidity theorem of lattice, such as Margulis' super-rigidity theorem and Zimmer's cocycle super-rigidity theorem play important roles in reduction of lattice actions.

If $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent, as we showed in Proposition 2.5 all elements in $\alpha([\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}])$ are not ergodic, where $[\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}]$ is the commutator group of $\mathcal{H}$, which means we can't pass to a $\mathbb{Z}^2$ ergodic action; and since any representation of an semisimple Lie group preserves semisimple and unipotent elements respectively, it is impossible to extend the action α to G even if $\mathcal{H}$ sits inside a semisimple group G.

In this paper we prove local differentiable rigidity for higher rank ergodic nilpotent action by toral automorphisms. We also show the existence of genuine partially hyperbolic nilpotent action. Our method is based on KAM-type iteration scheme that was first introduced in [2] and was later developed in [3]. In their proofs the commutativity of the action is essential. The natural difficulty in non-abelian type arguments is related to the complexity of the cocycle equations related to commutator relations between non-abelian generators. For example, in [14] we extended the method to treat the nipotent action of length 2, that is, the Heisenberg group action. However, even for the most simple non-abelian case, the calculation is complex. To prove the theorem, we make sufficient reduction and establish new orbit increasing relations between two ergodic generators.

Definition 1.2. An action α' of $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{T}^{N'}$ is an algebraic factor of an action α of $\mathcal{H}$ on $\mathbb{T}^N$ if there exists an epimorphism $h : \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{T}^{N'}$ such that $h \circ \alpha = \alpha' \circ h$.

An action α' is a rank one factor if it is an algebraic factor and if $\alpha'(\mathcal{H})$ contains a cyclic subgroup of finite index.

Condition $(\mathfrak{R})$ is always viewed as a paradigm for differential rigidity phenomena. An ergodic action α by toral automorphisms has no nontrivial rank one factors if and only if it satisfies condition $(\mathfrak{R})$ (see for example [13]). All the examples given so far are based on this condition. In this paper we obtain a class of examples where the above condition fails but enjoys differential rigidity property. The basic idea is for dual orbits with large projections in the subspace admitting rank-one factors, its increasing speed for well chosen non-ergodic (or unipotent) elements is fast enough to obtain tame estimates for the size of obstructions; and we have enough such non-ergodic (or unipotent) elements to cover all integer vectors inside the subspace. The polynomial increasing speed for unipotent elements play a crucial role in the proof.

1.1. **Statement of the main result.** Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a finitely generated group and $\alpha : \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{T}^N$ is given by an embedding $\rho_\alpha : \mathbb{Z}^N \to GL(N,\mathbb{Z})$ so that

$$\alpha(g,x) = \rho_\alpha(g)(x)$$

for any $g \in \mathcal{H}$ and any $x \in \mathbb{T}^N$. Let $\alpha : \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{T}^N$ be an action of $\mathcal{H}$ by automorphisms of the N-dimensional torus. Throughout the paper, we will write simply $\alpha(g)$ for $\bar{g}$ if needed.

In next theorem we assume $\mathcal{H}$ is not abelian, otherwise it is Theorem 1 in [2].

Theorem 1.3. *If $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent (not abelian) and α is a higher rank ergodic action, then there exists a constant $l(\alpha, N)$ such that α is $C^{\infty,l,\infty}$ locally rigid.*

For any unipotent element $U \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ let $p_1(U) = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^N : Uv = v\}$. Suppose A_1 is an ergodic element in $GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ and A_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$ are unipotent element $U \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ satisfying $A_1 A_i = A_i A_1$ and $(A_i - I_N)^2 = 0$, $2 \leq i \leq n$. Also suppose $\bigcap_{i=2}^{n} p_1(A_i) = \{0\}$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a group generated by A_i, $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Theorem 1.4. *For the action α described above, there exists a constant $l(\alpha, N)$ such that α is $C^{\infty,l,\infty}$ locally rigid.*

Remark 1.5.

Let us call an action of $\mathcal{H}$ by automorphisms of a torus genuinely partially hyperbolic if it is ergodic with respect to Lebesgue measure but no element of the action is hyperbolic (Anosov). It is easy to see that this is equivalent to simultaneous existence of

(1) an element of the action none of whose eigenvalues is a root of unity and
(2) an invariant linear foliation on which there is no exponential expansion/contraction for any element of the action.

As before, such an action is higher rank if and only if it contains two elements A, B such that $A^{k_1} B^{k_2}$ is ergodic if $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash 0$.

Theorem 1.6. *Genuinely partially hyperbolic higher rank nilpotent $\mathcal{H}$ actions exist: on any torus of even dimension $N \geq 6$ there are irreducible examples while on any torus of odd dimension $N \geq 9$ there are only reducible examples. There are no examples on tori of dimension $N \leq 5$ and $N = 7$.*

2. Setting of the problem and the KAM scheme

Before proceeding to specifics we will show how the general KAM scheme described in [2, Section 3.3] and [3, Section 1.1] is adapted to the $\mathcal{H}$ action α, which also clarifies the proof line of the paper.

Step 1. *Setting up the linearized equation*

Let $\widetilde{\alpha}$ be a small perturbation of α. To prove the existence of a C^∞ map H such that $\widetilde{\alpha} \circ H = H \circ \alpha$, we need to solve the nonlinear conjugacy problem

$$\alpha(g) \circ \Omega - \Omega \circ \alpha(g) = -R_g \circ (I + \Omega), \qquad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}$$

where $\widetilde{\alpha}(g,\cdot) = \alpha(g,\cdot) + R_g(\cdot)$ and $H = I + \Omega$; and the corresponding linearized conjugacy equation is

$$\alpha(g) \circ \Omega - \Omega \circ \alpha(g) = -R_g, \qquad \forall g \in \mathcal{H} \tag{2.1}$$

for small Ω and R.

Lemma 2.2 shows that obtaining a C^∞ conjugacy for one ergodic generator suffices for the proof of Theorem 1.3. Hence we just need to solve equation (2.1) for one ergodic generator.

Step 2. *Solving the linearized conjugacy equation for a particular element.*

We classify the obstructions for solving the linearized equation (2.1) for an individual generator (see Lemma 3.7 and 3.8) and obtain tame estimates are obtained for the solution. This means finite loss of regularity in the chosen collection of norms in the Fréchet spaces, such as C^r or Sobolev norms.

Step 3. *Constructing projection of the perturbation to the twisted cocycle space.*

Since $R_g(x)$, where $g \in \mathcal{H}$ and $x \in \mathbb{T}^N$ is a twisted cocycle not over α but over $\widetilde{\alpha}$ (see Lemma 3.3 of [2]), (2.1) is not a twisted coboundary equation over the linear action α, just an approximation. Then we define the cocycle difference function:

$$\mathcal{L}(x,y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} R_x \circ \bar{y} + \bar{x} R_y - R_y \circ \overline{xz} - \bar{y} R_x \circ \bar{z} - \overline{yx} R_z \tag{2.2}$$

for $x, y \in \mathcal{H}$ and $z = x^{-1}y^{-1}xy$.

It is clear that if $\mathcal{L} = 0$ then R is a twisted cocycle over α. But even if (2.1) is a twisted coboundary over α, it is impossible to produce a C^∞ conjugacy for a single ergodic generator of the action.

Therefore, when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent (not abelian), i.e., to prove Theorem 1.3 we consider $\mathfrak{n} + 2$ generators, g_1, d_0 and $d_j = D_j(g_1, d_0)$, $0 \le j \le \mathfrak{n}$ ($\mathfrak{n}$ and D_j are defined in (1) of Section 2.2) and reduce the problem of solving the linearized equation (2.1) to solving simultaneously the following system:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} \circ \Omega - \Omega \circ \mathcal{A} &= -R_{g_1} \\ \overline{d_j} \circ \Omega - \Omega \circ \overline{d_j} &= -R_{d_j} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \overline{g_1}$ and $\overline{d_0} = \mathcal{B}$. $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ are ergodic generators constructed at the beginning of Section 4).

When $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{Z}^2$, to prove Theorem 1.4 we consider 2 generators A_1 and A_2 and reduce the problem of solving the linearized equation (2.1) to solving simultaneously the following system:

$$A_i \circ \Omega - \Omega \circ A_i = -R_{A_i}, \qquad i = 1, 2. \tag{2.4}$$

As mentioned above, R does not satisfy this twisted cocycle condition:

$$\mathcal{L}(x,y) = R_x \circ \bar{y} + \bar{x} R_y - R_y \circ \overline{xz} - \bar{y} R_x \circ \bar{z} - \overline{yx} R_z = 0.$$

However the difference

$$\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_j), \qquad 0 \le j \le \mathfrak{n}$$

when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent (not abelian) or

$$\mathcal{L}(A_1, A_2)$$

when $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{Z}^2$ are quadratically small with respect to R, (see Lemma 2.1 and Remark **??**). More precisely, the perturbation R can be split into two terms

$$R = \mathcal{P}R + \mathcal{E}(R)$$

so that $\mathcal{P}R$ is in the space of twisted cocycles and the error $\mathcal{E}(R)$ is bounded by the size of $\mathcal{L}$ with the fixed loss of regularity. More precisely, the system

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{P}R_{g_1} &= -(R_{g_1} - \mathcal{E}(R_{g_1})) = \mathcal{A}\Omega - \Omega \circ \mathcal{A}, \\ -\mathcal{P}R_{d_j} &= -(R_{d_j} - \mathcal{E}(R_{d_j})) = \overline{d_j}\Omega - \Omega \circ \overline{d_j}, \quad 0 \leq j \leq \mathfrak{n} \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent (not abelian); or

$$-\mathcal{P}R_{A_i} = -(R_{A_i} - \mathcal{E}(R_{A_i})) = A_i\Omega - \Omega \circ A_i, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq 2 \tag{2.6}$$

when $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{Z}^2$, have a common solution Ω after subtracting a part bounded by the size of $\mathcal{L}$, which is quadratically small to R. (see Proposition 4.3 and 5.1).

Step 4. *Conjugacy transforms the perturbed action into an action quadratically close to the target.*

The common approximate solution Ω to the equations (2.5) above provides a new perturbation

$$\widetilde{\alpha}^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} H^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\alpha} \circ H$$

where $H = I + \Omega$, is much closer to α than $\widetilde{\alpha}$; i.e., the new error

$$R^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \widetilde{\alpha}^{(1)} - \alpha$$

is expected to be small with respect to the old error R.

Step 5. *The process is iterated and the conjugacy is obtained.*

The iteration process is set and is carried out, producing a C^∞ conjugacy which works for the action generated by the $\mathfrak{n}+1$ generators $\mathcal{A}$, $\overline{d_0} = \mathcal{B}$ and $\overline{d_j}$, $0 \leq j \leq \mathfrak{n}$ when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent (not abelian); and works for the action generated by the 2 generators A_1 and A_2 when $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{Z}^2$. Ergodicity assures that it works for all the other elements of the action α.

What is described above highlights the essential features of the KAM scheme for the $\mathcal{H}$ action on torus. The last two steps can follow Section 5.2-5.4 in [2] word by word with minor modification. Hence completeness of Step 2 and 3 admits the conclusion of Theorem 1.3 an 1.4.

At the end of the this seciton, we prove a simple lemma which shows that obtaining a C^∞ conjugacy for one ergodic generator suffices for the proof of Theorem 1.3 and 1.4. Next, we state a fact which is necessary for the proof.

Lemma 2.1. [2, Lemma 3.2] *For any C^1 small enough map $F : \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{T}^N$, if $AF = F \circ A$, where $A \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ and is ergodic, then $F = 0$.*

Lemma 2.2. *Let α be a finitely generated nilpotent group $\mathcal{H}$ action by automorphisms of $\mathbb{T}^N$ such that for some $g \in \mathcal{H}$ the automorphism $\alpha(g)$ is ergodic. Let $\widetilde{\alpha}$ be a C^1 small perturbation of α such that there exists a C^∞ map $H : \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{T}^N$ which is C^1 close to identity and satisfies*

$$\widetilde{\alpha}(g) \circ H = H \circ \alpha(g).$$

Then H conjugates the corresponding maps for all the other elements of the action; i.e., for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$\widetilde{\alpha}(h) \circ H = H \circ \alpha(h). \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ has a lower central series of length n, i.e., a sequence of subgroups

$$\{e\} = \mathcal{H}_0 \lhd \mathcal{H}_1 \lhd \cdots \lhd \mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}$$

such that $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{j+1}] = \mathcal{H}_j$ where $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{j+1}]$ denotes the commutator of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j+1}$. Fix a set of generators for each $\mathcal{H}_j$ and denote this set by S_j. Note that each S_j can be chosen to be finite (see Lemma 2 of [1]).

We will use induction to show H conjugates all the other elements of α and $\widetilde{\alpha}$. Let h be any element in S_1. Since $hg = gh$ it follows from (2.7) and commutativity that

$$\alpha(g) \circ \tilde{h} = \tilde{h} \circ \alpha(g)$$

where $\tilde{h} = \alpha(h) \circ \mathcal{H}^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\alpha}(h)^{-1} \circ \mathcal{H}$. Lemma 2.1 shows that $\tilde{h} = I$, which means

$$\widetilde{\alpha}(h) \circ H = H \circ \alpha(h).$$

Arbitrariness of h implies that H conjugates all the elements in A_1 of α and $\widetilde{\alpha}$

Suppose H conjugates all the elements in $\mathcal{H}_j$ of α and $\widetilde{\alpha}$. For any $h \in S_{j+1}$ since $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{j+1}] \leq \mathcal{H}_j$, there exits $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}_j$ such that $hg = ghh_1$. By assumption, we have

$$\widetilde{\alpha}(gh_1^{-1}) \circ H = H \circ \alpha(gh_1^{-1}).$$

We obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha(g) \circ (\alpha(h) \circ H^{-1} \circ \widetilde{\alpha}(h)^{-1} \circ H) \\
&= \alpha(h) \circ (\alpha(gh_1^{-1}) \circ H^{-1}) \circ \widetilde{\alpha}(h)^{-1} \circ H \\
&= \alpha(h) \circ H^{-1}(\widetilde{\alpha}(gh_1^{-1}) \circ \widetilde{\alpha}(h)^{-1}) \circ \mathcal{H} \\
&= \alpha(h) \circ H^{-1}\widetilde{\alpha}(h^{-1}) \circ (\widetilde{\alpha}(g) \circ \mathcal{H}) \\
&= (\alpha(h) \circ H^{-1}\widetilde{\alpha}(h^{-1}) \circ \mathcal{H}) \circ \alpha(g).
\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 2.1 again, we get $\alpha(h) \circ H^{-1}\widetilde{\alpha}(h^{-1}) \circ H = I$, which implies that H conjugates $\alpha(h)$ and $\widetilde{\alpha}(h)$. Since S_{j+1} is a set of germinators of $\mathcal{H}_{j+1}$, H conjugates all the elements in $\mathcal{H}_{j+1}$ of α and $\widetilde{\alpha}$. Hence we get the conclusion. □

2.1. **Basic facts and some notations.**

2.2. **Some notations.** We try as much as possible to develop a unified system of notations. We will use notations from this section throughout subsequent sections. So the reader should consult this section if an unfamiliar symbol appears.

(1) Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent. If $\mathcal{H}$ has a lower central series of length $\mathfrak{n}$, i.e., a sequence of subgroups

$$\{e\} = \mathcal{H}_0 \lhd \mathcal{H}_1 \lhd \cdots \lhd \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{n}} = \mathcal{H}$$

such that $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{j+1}] = \mathcal{H}_j$ where $[\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{j+1}]$ denotes the commutator group of $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j+1}$.

For any two elements x, $y \in \mathcal{H}$, define $\mathfrak{n} - 1$ elements in $\mathcal{H}$ as follows: $D_1(x, y) = x^{-1}y^{-1}xy$, $D_{i+1}(x, y) = x^{-1}D_i(x, y)^{-1}xD_i(x, y)$, $1 \le i \le \mathfrak{n} - 2$.

(2) For any $F \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$, $\|F\| := \sup\{\|Fv\| : v \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } \|v\| = 1\}$ and $\|F\|_{\min} := \min\{\|Fv\| : v \in \mathbb{R}^N \text{ with } \|v\| = 1\}$. Then $\|F\|_{\min} = \|F^{-1}\|^{-1}$. For any m-Jordan block J of F with eigenvalue λ, we have

$$\|F^n \mid_J\| \le C|\lambda|^n(|n| + 1)^m, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.8}$$

For a sequence of matrices $F_i \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ $\prod_{i=1}^n F_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F_1 \cdots F_n$.

(3) Let $F \in GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$ be an ergodic integer matrix. The dual map F^* on $\mathbb{Z}^N$ induces a decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^N$ into expanding, neutral and contracting subspaces. We will denote the expanding subspace by $V_1(F)$, the contracting subspace by $V_3(F)$ and the neutral subspace by $V_2(F)$.

$$\mathbb{R}^N_F = V_1(F) \bigoplus V_2(F) \bigoplus V_3(F).$$

All three subspaces $V_i(F)$, $i = 1, 2, 3$ are F invariant and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|F^i v\| \ge C\rho^i \|v\|, && \rho > 1, \quad i \ge 0, && v \in V_1(F),\\
&\|F^i v\| \ge C\rho^{-i} \|v\|, && \rho > 1, \quad i \le 0, && v \in V_3(F),\\
&\|F^i v\| \ge C|i|^{-N} \|v\|, && \rho > 1, \quad i \ne 0, && v \in V_2(F).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

Here C is a constant dependent on F.

(4) For $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, $|v| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max\{\|\pi_1(v)\|, \|\pi_2(v)\|, \|\pi_3(v)\|\}$ where $\|\cdot\|$ is Euclidean norm and $\pi_i(v)$ are projections of v to subspaces V_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) from (2.9), that is, to the expanding, neutral, and contracting subspaces of $\mathbb{R}^N$ for F; we will use the norm which is more convenient in a particular situation; those are equivalent norms, the choice does not affect any results).

(5) For $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ we say v is *mostly* in $i(F)$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and will write $v \hookrightarrow i(F)$, if the projection $\pi_i(v)$ of v to the subspace V_i corresponding to F is sufficiently large:

$$|v| = \|\pi_i(v)\|;$$

if furthermore,

$$|v| = \|\pi(v)\| > \|\pi_j(v)\|, \qquad j \neq i$$

then we say that v is *absolutely* in $i(F)$ and write $v \to i(F)$. The notation $v \hookrightarrow 1,2(F)$ will be used for v which is mostly in $1(F)$ or mostly in $2(F)$. The notation $v \to 1,2(F)$ is defined accordingly.

(6) Call $n \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ minimal and denote it by $\mathcal{M}_F(n)$ if v is the lowest point on its F orbit in the sense that $n \hookrightarrow 3(F)$ and $Fn \to 1,2(F)$. We can assume there is one such minimal point on each nontrivial dual F orbit (other wise we consider F^n where n is big enough), we choose one on each dual F orbit and denote it by $\mathcal{M}_F(n)$. Then $\mathcal{M}_F(n)$ is substantially large both in $1,2(F)$ and in $3(F)$. Set $E_F = \{\mathcal{M}_F(v) : v \in \mathbb{Z}^n \backslash 0\}$.

(7) Let A and B be the two ergodic generators for α when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent. In what follows, C will denote any constant that depends only on the given linear $\mathcal{H}$ action α and on the dimension of the torus. $C_{x,y,z,\cdots}$ will denote any constant that in addition to the above depends also on parameters x, y, z, $\cdots$.

(8) Let θ be a C^∞ function. Then we can write $\theta = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}^N} \widehat{\theta}_n e_n$ where $e_v = e^{2\pi\sqrt{-1}v\cdot x}$ are the characters. Then

(i) $\|\theta\|_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_v |\widehat{\theta}_v||v|^a$, $a > 0$.

(ii) The following relations hold (see, for example, Section 3.1 of [12]):

$$\|\theta\|_r \leq C\|\theta\|_{C^r}, \qquad \|\theta\|_{C^r} \leq C\|\theta\|_{r+\sigma}$$

where $\sigma > N + 1$, and $r \in \mathbb{N}$.

(iii) For any $F \in SL(N,\mathbb{Z})$ $(\widehat{\theta \circ F})_n = \widehat{\theta}_{(F^\tau)^{-1}n}$ where F^τ denotes transpose matrix. We call $(F^\tau)^{-1}$ the dual map on $\mathbb{Z}^N$. To simplify the notation in the rest of the paper, whenever there is no confusion as to which map we refer to we will denote the dual map by the same symbol F.

(9) For a map $\mathcal{F}$ with coordinate functions f_i $(i = 1, \cdots, k)$ define $\|\mathcal{F}\|_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{1\leq i\leq k}\|f_i\|_a$. For two maps $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ define $\|\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}\|_a \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\|\mathcal{F}\|_a, \|\mathcal{G}\|_a\}$. $\|\mathcal{F}\|_{C^r}$ and $\|\mathcal{F},\mathcal{G}\|_{C^r}$ are defined similarly. For any $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ((\widehat{f_1})_v, \cdots, (\widehat{f_k})_v)$. For any $F \in GL(N,\mathbb{Z})$,

$$\Delta_F\mathcal{F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F\mathcal{F} - \mathcal{F} \circ F.$$

2.3. **Basic facts about nilpotent actions on torus.** For an abelian action over a compact manifold, there is a splitting of the tangent bundle into Lyapunov spaces (see [8]). Proposition 2.5 shows that similar result holds for nilpotent action by toral automorphism. In fact, it is not hard to show it also applies to general nilpotent actions for any length $\mathfrak{n}$. The case of $\mathfrak{n} = 2$ was prove in [14].

The next two lemmas are essential for the proof of the proposition. The first lemma shows that for any products with elements coming from a finite set, we can reorder the the product with a tame price: the word growth rate is polynomial; furthermore, if the size of these elements increase tamely, then the size of the product also has tame increasing rate.

Lemma 2.3. *Let S be a finite set in $\mathcal{H}$ and set $S' = \{[s_i^{\delta_i}, \cdots [s_1^{\delta_1}, s_2^{\delta_2}] \cdots] : s_i \in S, \delta_i = \pm 1\}$. Then there exists a polynomial p, such that any product $\prod_{i=1}^n s_i$ where $s_i \in S$ can be expressed as*

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i = d(s_1')^{k_1} \cdots (s_j')^{k_j}, \qquad j \le \sharp(S), \quad \sum_{i=1}^{j} k_i = n$$

where $s_i' \in \{s_i : 1 \le i \le n\}$, and $(s_1')^{k_1} \cdots (s_j')^{k_j}$ is a reordered product of $\prod_{i=1}^n s_i$ and d is a product of elements in S' with word length bounded by $p(n)$.

Proof. We prove the following claim $(*)$ instead, which implies the conclusion immediately.
$(*)$ There exists a polynomial p, such that any product $(\prod_{i=1}^n s_i)(s_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} s_i)^{-1}$ where $s_i \in S$ can be expressed as s product of elements in S' with word length bounded by $p(n)$.

It is clear that S' is also a finite set. Let S_i' denote the set of elements in S' with (commutator) length i. Then $S' = \bigcup_{i=2}^{\mathfrak{n}} S_i'$. Moving s_n from right side of s_{n-1} to left side of s_{n-1}, we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_i = s_1 \cdots s_{n-2}(d_{2,1} s_n) s_{n-1}$$

where $d_{2,1} = [s_{n-1}^{-1}, s_n^{-1}] \in S_2'$ if not trvial.

Next, we move $d_{2,1}s_n$ from right side of s_{n-2} to left side of s_{n-2}. That is:

$$s_1 \cdots s_{n-2}(d_{2,1}s_n)s_{n-1} = s_1 \cdots s_{n-3}(d_{2,1}' d_{2,1} d_{3,1} s_n) s_{n-2} s_{n-1}$$

where $d_{3,1} = [s_{n-2}^{-1}, s_n^{-1}] \in S_2'$ and $d_{2,1}' = [s_{n-2}^{-1}, d_{2,1}^{-1}] \in S_3'$ if they are not trivial.

We continue this process. In process of step i, we have a form

$$s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{n-i+1}(e_1 \cdots e_{j(i)} s_n) s_{n-i+2} \cdots s_{n-1}$$

where $e_j \in S'$. We need to move the product $e_1 \cdots e_{j(i)} s_n$ from right side of s_{n-i+1} to left side of s_{n-i+1}. That is, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{n-i+1}(e_1 \cdots e_{j(i)} s_n) s_{n-i+2} \cdots s_{n-1} \\ &= s_1 s_2 \cdots s_{n-i}(e_1' e_1 \cdots e_{j(i)}' e_{j(i)} d_{i+1,1} s_n) s_{n-i+1} \cdots s_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

where $d_{i+1,1} = [s_{n-i+1}^{-1}, s_n^{-1}] \in S_1'$ and $e_j' = [s_{n-2}^{-1}, e_j^{-1}]$. Note that the length of e_j' is equal to 1 plus that of e_j if not trivial.

We denote the number of elements of length k in the form $e_1' e_1 \cdots e_{j(i)}' e_{j(i)} d_{i+1,1}$ by $\beta_{k,i}$. For examples, for the word $e_1 e_2 e_1 e_3 e_4$ where $e_1, e_3 \in S_2'$ and $e_1, e_4 \in S_3'$, $\beta_{2,i} = 3$, $\beta_{3,i} = 2$. For repeating elements, we count the number as if they are different elements. Then we have

$$\beta_{2,i} \leq \beta_{2,i-1} + 1, \quad \beta_{k,i} \leq \beta_{k,i-1} + \beta_{k-1,i-1}, \quad \forall k \leq \mathfrak{n}.$$

Above relations show that we get a polynomil p such that

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\mathfrak{n}} \beta_{k,i} \leq p(n), \qquad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Then we finish the proof. □

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a nilpotent subgroup in $GL(N, \mathbb{Z})$. Suppose for any element $g \in \mathcal{H}$, all eigenvalues of g are of absolute value 1. Let S be a finite set in $\mathcal{H}$. Then there exists a polynomial p, such that for any product $\prod_{i=1}^n s_i$ where $s_i \in S$, $\|\prod_{i=1}^n s_i\| \leq p(n)$.*

Proof. We prove by using induction. Denote by $S = \{s_1, \cdots, s_d\}$ and set $S' = \{[s_i, \cdots [s_1, s_2] \cdots] : s_i \in S\}$. If $S \subset \mathcal{H}_1$, since $\mathcal{H}_1$ is abelian we can write

$$\prod_{i=1}^n s_{j_i} = s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^j k_i = n$ and $s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_j}$ is a reordered product of $\prod_{i=1}^n s_{j_i}$. Since each s_i only has polynomial growth rate, there exist $C_S > 0$ such that

$$\|\prod_{i=1}^n s_i\| \leq C_S \Pi_{i=1}^s (|k_i| + 1)^N \leq C_S (n+1)^{sN}.$$

Then we proved the case of $S \subset \mathcal{H}_1$.

Suppose the conclusion holds for any $S \subset \mathcal{H}_i$. Next, we will prove the case when $S \subset \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. By Lemma 2.3 we can write

$$\prod_{i=1}^n s_{j_i} = r s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^j k_i = n$, $s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d}$ is a reordered product of $\prod_{i=1}^n s_{j_i}$ and r is a product of elements in S' with word length bounded by $f(n)$ for a polynomial

f determined by S. Since $S' \subset \mathcal{H}_i$, by assumption there exists a polynomial f_1 determined by S' such that

$$\|r\| \leq C_S f_1(f(n)).$$

Hence we get

$$\|\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_{j_i}\| \leq \|s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d}\| \cdot \|r\| \leq C_S (n+1)^{sN} f_1(f(n)),$$

which implies the conclusion for the case of $S \subset \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. Then we finish the proof. □

By using the two lemmas, we can proceed to the proof of the following:

Proposition 2.5. *Suppose $\mathcal{H}$ has a lower central series of length $\mathfrak{n}$. Then*

1. *all Lyapunov exponents of $\alpha(z)$ are 0 if $z \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathfrak{n}-1}$;*
2. *for any x, $y \in \mathcal{H}$, $\alpha(x)$ and $\alpha(y)$ preserve Lyapunov spaces of each other;*
3. *the Lyapunov exponents of $\alpha(xy)$ is sum of corresponding Lyapunov exponents of x and y.*
4. *let $S = \{s_1, \cdots, s_d\}$ be a finite set in $\mathcal{H}$. Then there exists a polynomial p such that*

$$\begin{aligned} C_S' p(n)^{-1} &\leq \|s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d} (\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_{j_i})^{-1}\|_{min} \\ &\leq \|s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d} (\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_{j_i})^{-1}\| \leq C_S p(n) \end{aligned}$$

where $s_1^{k_1} \cdots s_d^{k_d}$ is a reordered product of $\prod_{i=1}^{n} s_{j_i}$.

Proof. In this part we identify $\alpha(x)$ and x for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ if there is no confusion. We just need to prove the first three statements. (4) follows from (1), Lemma 2.3 and 2.4 immediately.

Obviously, (1) holds for any $z \in \mathcal{H}_0$; and (2) and (3) hold if $D_1(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}_0$ (see (1) of Section 2.2).

Suppose (1) holds for any $z \in \mathcal{H}_i$; and (2) and (3) hold for any x, y if $D_1(x, y) \in \mathcal{H}_i$, $i < \mathfrak{n} - 1$. Next, firstly we will show that (1) holds for any $z \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. Suppose $z = D_1(z_1, z_2)$ for some z_1, $z_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. Inductively we can show that for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$z_1 z_2^n = z_2^n z_1 D_1(z_1, z_2)^n f_n, \qquad f_n \in \mathcal{H}_i.$$

Then by assumption there exists a a full measure set $\Gamma_{z_1,z_2,z}$ such that the Lyapunov exponents of $z_1 D_1(z_1, z_2)^n f_n$ are of the form $\lambda + n\mu$ where λ and μ are corresponding Lyapunov exponents of z_1 and $D_1(z_1, z_2)$ since all Lyapunov exponents of f_n are 0 by assumption. The fact that $z_1 D_1(z_1, z_2)^n f_n$ are conjugated with z_1 for all n means there exists a a full measure set $\Gamma'_{z_1,z_2,z}$ such that all Lyapunov exponents of $D_1(z_1, z_2) = z$ are 0. Since

$\mathcal{H}_{i+1}$ is generated by such z who is a commutator of a pair of elements in $\mathcal{H}$, then by assumption it follows that (1) holds for any $z \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$.

Finally, we will show that (2) and (3) hold for any x, y if $D_1(x,y) \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. Note that $D_1(x, D_1(x,y)) \in \mathcal{H}_i$, by assumption the Lyapunov exponents of $xD_1(x,y)$ are the sum of corresponding Lyapunov exponents of x and $D_1(x,y)$. As we just showed that all Lyapunov exponents of $D_1(x,y)$ are 0, then we see that $xD_1(x,y)$ and x have the exactly the same Lyapunov spaces. Hence the relation $xy = yxD_1(x,y)$ implies that y preserves each Lyapunov space of x. Also, relation $yx = xyD_1(x,y)^{-1}$ implies that x preserves each Lyapunov space of y. Then we proved (2) in the case of $D_1(x,y) \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$.

Since $D_1(x,y) \in \mathcal{H}_{i+1}$, $S' = \{[x, \cdots [y,x] \cdots] : \text{ for all lenth}\}$ is in $\mathcal{H}_{i+1}$. By Lemma 2.3 we can write

$$(xy)^k = e_k x^k y^k \tag{2.10}$$

where e_k is a product of elements in S' with word length bounded by $p(k)$, where p is a polynomial determined by x, y. Since all elements in $\mathcal{H}_{i+1}$ are with all Lyapunov exponents 0 as we proved, by Lemma 2.4 we get

$$\|e_k\| \leq p_1(|k|), \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.11}$$

For y we have a decomposition:

$$\mathbb{R}^N = \bigoplus_{i \in I} J_{\mu_i} \tag{2.12}$$

where J_{μ_i} is the Lyapunov space of y with Lyapunov exponent μ_i.

Since x preserves Lyapunov spaces y, each J_{μ_i} is x-invariant. Then we have a decomposition for each J_{μ_i}:

$$J_{\mu_i} = \bigoplus_{j \in J_i} J_{\lambda_{j(i)}, \mu_i}$$

such that each $J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}$ is a Lyapunov space of x on J_{μ_i} with Lyapunov exponent $\lambda_{j(i)}$.

Using (2.10), (2.11) and (2.8) for any $v \in J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}$ we have

$$\|(xy)^k v\| = \|e_k x^k y^k v\| \leq C_{x,y} p_1(k) e^{(\lambda_{j(i)} + \mu_i)k} (|k|+1)^N \|v\|$$

for any $k > 0$.

It follows that

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} k^{-1} \log \|(xy)^k \mid_{J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}}\| \leq \lambda_{j(i)} + \mu_i$$

On the other hand, applying similar reasoning we can show

$$\lim_{k \to +\infty} k^{-1} \log \|(xy)^{-k} \mid_{J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}}\| \leq -\lambda_{j(i)} - \mu_i,$$

which implies:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lim_{k \to +\infty} k^{-1} \log \|(xy)^k \mid_{J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}}\|_{\min} \\ &= \lim_{k \to +\infty} (-k)^{-1} \log \|(xy)^{-k} \mid_{J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}}\| \geq \lambda_{j(i)} + \mu_i. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that the Lyapunov exponent of xy on $J_{\lambda_{j(i)},\mu_i}$ is $\lambda_{j(i)}+\mu_i$. Then we proved (3) in case of $D_1(x,y)\in\mathcal{H}_{i+1}$.

□

Remark 2.6. It is a result of Kronecker [10] which states that an integer matrix with all eigenvalues on the unit circle has to have all eigenvalues roots of unity. Then (1) implies all elements in $\alpha([\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}])$ are not ergodic.

Then next two corollaries are simple, but will be frequently used in the subsequent part of this section.

Corollary 2.7. (1) *For any $y\in\mathcal{H}$ and any Lyapunov space V of A (see (7) of Section 2.2) we have*

$$\|A^n\bar{y}A^{-n}\mid_V\|\le C(|n|+1)^{2N}\|\bar{y}\mid_V\|,\quad \forall n\in\mathbb{Z}\backslash 0.$$

(2) *for any $n\in\mathbb{Z}\backslash 0$ and $1\le i\le\mathfrak{n}-1$,*

$$\|D_i(A^n,\bar{y})^{\pm 1}\|\le C\|\bar{y}^{\pm 1}\|^{2^i}|n|^{2^{i+1}N}.$$

Proof. On any Lyapunov space V, choose a basis in which A has its Jordan normal form xJ, where x is diagonal and J is unipotent. It is clear that

$$\|x^n\bar{y}x^{-n}\mid_V\|\le C_A\|\bar{y}\mid_V\|,\qquad \forall n\in\mathbb{Z}.$$

By using (2.8) for any $n\in\mathbb{Z}\backslash 0$ we have

$$\|A^n\bar{y}A^{-n}\mid_V\|\le C_A\|\bar{y}\mid_V\|\cdot\|J^n\|^2\le C_A|n|^{2N}\|\bar{y}\mid_V\|.$$

(2) is a direct consequence of (1). □

For any $y\in\mathcal{H}$ and $x\in[\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}]$, if $\bar{y}$ is Anosov then $\overline{xy}$ is Anosov, which is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.5. If $\bar{y}$ is ergodic, the next result shows that $\overline{xy}$ is also ergodic.

Corollary 2.8. *For any $y\in\mathcal{H}$ and $x\in[\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}]$, if $\bar{y}$ is ergodic then $\overline{xy}$ is also ergodic.*

Proof. If xy is not ergodic, there exists a vector $v\neq 0$ such that $(xy)^m v=v$, $m>0$. For any $0\neq u\in J_{0,\mu_i}$ (all Lyapunov exponents of x are 0 by Proposition of 2.5), using (2.10) and (4) of Proposition of 2.5 we have

$$\|(xy)^k u\|=\|e_k x^k y^k u\|\ge C_{x,y}e^{\mu_i k}(k+1)^{-N}p(k)^{-1}\|u\|$$

for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and a polynomial p. It follows that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}k^{-1}\log\|(xy)^k u\|\ge\mu_i.$$

Since $\pi_1(v)\neq 0$ by ergodicity of $\bar{y}$ we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}k^{-1}\log\|(xy)^{km}\pi_1(v)\|>0.$$

On the other hand, since

$$k^{-1}\log\|v\|=k^{-1}\log\|(xy)^{km}v\|\ge k^{-1}\log C\|(xy)^{km}\pi_1(v)\|,$$

where C is a constant only dependent on x and y, we get a contradiction

$$0 = \lim_{k\to\infty} k^{-1}\log\|v\| = \lim_{k\to\infty} k^{-1}\log\|(xy)^{km}\pi_1(v)\| > 0.$$

Hence we get the conclusion. □

At the end of this section, we make a slight digression to prove following results, whose role will be clear in Section 4. Above corollary shows that as n increases, the norm of $D_i(A^n,\bar{y})$ increases polynomially, while that of A^n increase or deceases exponentially along hyperbolic directions. Then by increasing n, we can let the set $\{\mathcal{M}_{A^n}(D_i(A^n,\bar{y})v) : v \in E_{A^n}\}$ (see (6) of Section 2.2) be at most one step (future or past) away from E_{A^n}.

Lemma 2.9. *For any $c > 0$ there exists $N_1(c) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq N_1$ and any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ with $|\bar{x}| \leq c$, if $v = \mathcal{M}_{A^n}(v)$ then*

$$\mathcal{M}_{A^n}\big(D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v\big) = A^{nj}D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v, \qquad j = 0,\pm 1$$

for any $1 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{n}$.

Proof. To simply notion we use $d_n(i)$ to denote $D_i(A^n,\bar{x})$. If

$$\|\pi_3(d_n(i)v)\| \geq \|\pi_{1,2}(d_n(i)v)\|,$$

(see (5) of Section 2.2), for any $n > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^{2n}d_n(i)v)|}{|\pi_3(A^{2n}d_n(i)v)|} &\overset{(1)}{=} \frac{|A^{2n}d_n(i)A^{-n}\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{|A^{2n}d_n(i)A^{-n}\pi_3(A^nv)|}\\
&\geq \frac{|A^{2n}d_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min}\cdot|\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{\|A^{2n}d_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_3A}\|\cdot|\pi_3(A^nv)|}\\
&\geq \frac{|A^n\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min}\cdot|A^nd_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min}\cdot|\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{|A^n\,|_{V_3A}|\cdot|A^nd_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_3A}|\cdot|\pi_3(A^nv)|}\\
&\overset{(2)}{\geq} \frac{C|n|^{-2N}|A^n\,|_{V_{1,2}(A)}|_{\min}\cdot\|d_n(i)\|_{\min}\cdot|\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{|n|^{2N}|A^n\,|_{V_3(A)}|\cdot\|d_n(i)\|\cdot|\pi_3(A^nv)|}\\
&\overset{(3)}{\geq} \frac{C_c|n|^{-(3+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})N}\cdot|\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{|n|^{(3+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})N}\rho^{-n}|\pi_3(A^nv)|}\\
&\overset{(4)}{>} C_c|n|^{-(6+2^{\mathfrak{n}+2})N}\rho^n > 1 \qquad (2.13)
\end{aligned}$$

proving n is big enough. Here ρ is defined in (2.9) of Section 2.2

Here (1) is from the fact that $d_n(i)$ preserves Lyapunov spaces of A; in (2) since

$$|A^nd_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min} = |A^nd_n(i)^{-1}A^{-n}\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|^{-1}$$

(1) of Corollary 2.7 shows:

$$\begin{aligned}
|A^nd_n(i)A^{-n}\,|_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min} &\geq C|n|^{-2N}\|d_n(i)^{-1}\|^{-1} = C|n|^{-2N}\|d_n(i)\|_{\min}\\
&\geq C|\bar{x}^{-1}|^{2^{\mathfrak{n}}}|n|^{-(2^{i+1}+1)N} \geq C_c|n|^{-(2^{i+1}+1)N}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence we get (2); in (3) we use the observation:

$$|A^n\ |_{V_{1,2}A}|_{\min} \geq |A^n\ |_{V_2A}|_{\min} \geq C\|n\|^{-N};$$

in (4) we use the fact $\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)|}{|\pi_3(A^nv)|} > 1$.

This implies that in this condition we get

$$\mathcal{M}_{A^n}\big(D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v\big) = A^{nj}D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v, \qquad j = 0, 1.$$

If $|\pi_3(d_n(i)v)| < |\pi_{1,2}(d_n(i)v)|$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^{-n}d_n(i)v)|}{|\pi_3(A^{-n}d_n(i)v)|} &= \frac{|A^{-n}d_n(i)\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{|A^{-n}d_n(i)\pi_3(v)|} \\
&\leq \frac{\|A^{-n}d_n(i)\ |_{V_{1,2}A}\| \cdot |\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{\|A^{-n}d_n(i)\ |_{V_3A}\|_{\min} \cdot |\pi_3(v)|} \\
&\leq \frac{C_c|n|^{2N}|n|^{2^{\mathfrak{n}+1}N} \cdot |\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{|n|^{-2^{\mathfrak{n}+1}N}\rho^n|\pi_3(v)|} \\
&\leq C_c|n|^{(2^{\mathfrak{n}+2}+2)N}\rho^{-n} < 1 \qquad (2.14)
\end{aligned}$$

providing n is big enough.

In the last step we used $\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{|\pi_3(v)|} \leq 1$. Then in this condition we have

$$\mathcal{M}_{A^n}\big(D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v\big) = A^{nj}D_i(A^n,\bar{x})v, \qquad j = -1.$$

similarly, we obtain

Let N_1 be the integer which satisfies the inequalities

$$C_c|N_1|^{(2^{\mathfrak{n}+2}+2)N}\rho^{-N_1} < 1 \quad \text{and} \quad C_c|N_1|^{-(6+2^{\mathfrak{n}+2})N}\rho^{N_1} > 1.$$

Then (2.13) and (2.14) show that N_1 what we need.

□

For any $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ if $\frac{\pi_{1,2}(v)}{\pi_3(v)} > 1$, then $v \notin E_{A^n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}\backslash 0$; on the other hand, conditions $\frac{\pi_{1,2}(v)}{\pi_3(v)} < 1$ and $\frac{\pi_{1,2}(A^nv)}{\pi_3(A^nv)} < 1$ should be satisfied at the same time to guarantee $v \notin E_{A^n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The next lemma lists several criterions to tell wether a vector is in E_{A^n} or nor for big enough n.

Lemma 2.10. *For any $c > 0$ there exists $N_2(c) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $n \geq N_2$, any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ with $|\alpha(x)| \leq c$, if denote $D_i(A^n,\bar{x})$ by $d_n(i)$ and set*

$$A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2} = d_n(i_1)(A^nd_n(l_1))^{j_1}d_n(i_2)(A^nd_n(l_2))^{j_2}(A^nd_n(l_3))^{j_3},$$

where $1 \leq i_1, i_2, l_1, l_2, l_3 \leq \mathfrak{n}$ and $j_1, j_2, j_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$, then:

(1) *for $v \in E_{A^n}$*
   a) *if $j_1, j_2, j_3 \geq 0$ (resp. $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 0$) satisfying $\sum_{i=1}^3 |j_i| \geq 2$, then*

$$A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v \notin E_{A^n};$$

b) *if* $j_1, j_2, j_3 \geq 0$ *(resp.* $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 0$*) and* $\sum_{i=1}^{3} |j_i| \geq 3$*, and if*

$$A^{nz} A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} v \in E_{A^n}$$

for some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$*, then* $z \leq -2$ *(resp.* $z \geq 2$*).*

(2) *if* $A^{nm} v \in E_{A^n}$ $m \geq 1$ *(resp.* $m \leq -2$*), then:*

a) $d_{n,i_1}(A^n d_{n,l_1})^{j_1} v \notin E_{A^n}$ *if* $j_1 \leq -1$ *(resp.* $j_1 \geq 0$*);*

b) *if* $A^{nz} d_{n,i_1}(A^n d_{n,l_1})^{j_1} v \in E_{A^n}$ *for some* $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ *where* $j_1 \leq -1$ *(resp.* $j_1 \geq 1$*) then* $z \geq 1$ *(resp.* $z \leq -2$*).*

Proof. For A we have the following Lyapunov space decomposition:

$$\mathbb{R}^N = \bigoplus_{i \in I} J_{\mu_i}$$

where J_{μ_i} is the Lyapunov space of A with Lyapunov exponent μ_i. We choose a basis of $\mathbb{R}^N$ in which $A = x_1 x_2$, where x_1 is diagonal and x_2 is unipotent, x_1 and x_2 commute, and the eigenvalues of x_1 coincides with that of A. For any matrix y preserving Lyapunov space spaces of A we have

$$\|x_1^n y x_1^{-n}\| \leq C_A \|y\|, \qquad \forall n \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{2.15}$$

Noting x_2 is unipotent and using Corollary 2.7 we have

$$C_c(|n|+1)^{-(1+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})|j|N} \leq \|(x_2^n d_n(i))^j\| \leq C_c(|n|+1)^{(1+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})|j|N}. \tag{2.16}$$

Then (2.15) and (2.16) imply:

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A^k A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^m \mid_{J_{\mu_i}}\| \\ &\leq C_c^{|\mathfrak{j}|} e^{(n\mathfrak{j}+m+k)\mu_i} (|m|+1)^N (|k|+1)^N (|n|+1)^{2+(1+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})|\mathfrak{j}|N} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^m \mid_{J_{\mu_i}}\| \\ &\geq C_c^{|\mathfrak{j}|} e^{(n\mathfrak{j}+m)\mu_i} (|m|+1)^{-N} (|k|+1)^{-N} (|n|+1)^{-2-(1+2^{\mathfrak{n}+1})|\mathfrak{j}|N} \end{aligned}$$

for any J_{μ_i}. Here $\mathfrak{j} = j_1 + j_2 + j_3$ and $\mathfrak{j} = |j_1| + |j_2| + |j_3|$.

(a) of (1) for $j_1, j_2, j_3 \geq 0$: by applying above inequalities we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} v)|}{|\pi_3(A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} v)|} = \frac{|A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^{-n} \pi_{1,2}(Av)|}{|A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^{-n} \pi_3(Av)|} \\ &\geq \frac{|A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^{-n} \mid_{V_{1,2} A}|_{\min}}{|A(n, l_1, l_2, l_3)_{i_1, i_2}^{j_1, j_2, j_3} A^{-n} \mid_{V_3 A}|} \frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^n v)|}{|\pi_3(A^n v)|} \\ &> C_c^{\mathfrak{j}} \rho^{n(\mathfrak{j}-1)} (|n|+1)^{-6-(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathfrak{j}N} > 1 \end{aligned}$$

providing n is big enough. Here ρ is defined in (2.9) of Section 2.2. This implies the conclusion.

(a) of (1) for $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 0$: similar to the proof in (a) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}{|\pi_3(A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}\\&< \frac{|A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}\ |_{V_{1,2}A}|}{|A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}\ |_{V_3A}|_{\min}}\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{|\pi_3(v)|}\\&< C_c^{-\mathrm{j}}\rho^{n\mathrm{j}}(|n|+1)^{4+(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathrm{j}N} < 1\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^nA(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}{|\pi_3(A^nA(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}\\&< \frac{|A^nA(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}\ |_{V_{1,2}A}|}{|A^nA(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}\ |_{V_3A}|_{\min}}\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(v)|}{|\pi_3(v)|}\\&< C_c^{-\mathrm{j}}\rho^{n(\mathrm{j}+1)}(|n|+1)^{6+(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathrm{j}N} < 1\end{aligned}$$

providing n is big enough. Then we get the conclusion.

(b) of (1) for $j_1, j_2, j_3 \geq 0$: follow the proof line (a) we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}{|\pi_3(A^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}\\&> C_c^{\mathrm{j}}\rho^{n(\mathrm{j}-1+z)}(|n|+1)^{-4-|z|-(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathrm{j}N} > 1\end{aligned}$$

providing n is big enough and $z \geq -1$. Then we get the conclusion.

(b) of (1) for $j_1, j_2, j_3 \leq 0$: similarly, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}{|\pi_3(A^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}\\&< C_c^{-\mathrm{j}}\rho^{n(\mathrm{j}+z)}(|n|+1)^{4+|z|+(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathrm{j}N} < 1\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{|\pi_{1,2}(A^nA^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}{|\pi_3(A^nA^{nz}A(n,l_1,l_2,l_3)^{j_1,j_2,j_3}_{i_1,i_2}v)|}\\&< C_c^{-\mathrm{j}}\rho^{n(\mathrm{j}+1+z)}(|n|+1)^{4+|z|+(2+2^{2\mathfrak{n}+2})\mathrm{j}N} < 1\end{aligned}$$

providing n is big enough and $z \leq 1$. Then we get the conclusion.

(2) is a direct consequence of (1) and its proof. □

3. Orbit growth for the dual action

In this part we list several results about certain estimates of the C^r or Sobolev norms of specifically defined functions or maps if the exponential growth along individual orbits of the dual action are obtained.

Lemma 3.1 (Lemma 4.3, [2]). *Let F_1, F_2 be commuting integer matrices in $GL(N,\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose there exist constant $C, \tau > 0$ such that for every non-zero integer vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and for any $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,*

$$\|F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v\| \geq C \exp(\tau|k|)\|v\|^{-N}, \tag{3.1}$$

then:

a) *For any C^∞ function φ on the torus $\mathbb{T}^N$ and any $y = (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ the following sums:*

$$S_K(\varphi, v, y, p) = \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} y_1^{k_1} y_2^{k_2} \widehat{\varphi}_{F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v}$$

converge absolutely for any $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$.

c) *Assume in addition to the assumptions in b) that for a vector $n \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and for every $k \in K = K(v) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have*

$$p_1(|k|)\|F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v\| \geq \|v\| \tag{3.2}$$

where p_1 is a polynomial then we have

$$\begin{aligned} |S_K(\varphi, v, y, p)| &\leq \sum_{k\in K} |y_1|^{|k_1|} |y_2|^{|k_2|} |\widehat{\varphi}_{F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v}| \\ &\leq C_{a,|y|^{\pm 1},\delta} \|\varphi\|_a \|v\|^{-a+\kappa_y} \end{aligned}$$

for any $a > \kappa_y \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{N+1}{\tau}(|\log|y_1|| + |\log|y_2||)$.

d) *If the assumptions of c) are satisfied for every $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, then the function*

$$S(\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{v\in\mathbb{Z}^N} S_{K(v)}(\varphi, v, y, p) e_v$$

is a C^∞ function if φ is. Moreover, the following norm comparison holds:

$$\|S(\varphi)\|_{C^r} \leq C_{r,|y|^{\pm 1}} \|\varphi\|_{r+\sigma}$$

for any $r \geq 0$ and $\sigma > N + 2 + [\kappa_y]$.

Remark 3.2. If F is ergodic, then for any $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N \backslash 0$

$$\|\pi_1 v\| \geq C_F \|v\|^{-N} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\pi_3 v\| \geq C_F \|v\|^{-N}$$

where C_F is a constant only dependent on F (see Lemma 4.1 of [2] and [9]). τ can be chosen to be the growth rate in the hyperbolic direction corresponding to F.

The next result follows immediately from above lemma:

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose P_i, F_i, $i = 1, 2$ are integer matrices in $GL(N,\mathbb{Z})$ and $P_1 P_2 = P_2 P_1$, $F_1 F_2 = F_2 F_1$. Denote the eigenvalues of P by $y_1, \cdots, y_N$. Let $y = \sum_{j=1}^2 |\log\|P_j\||$. If condition (3.1) is satisfied, then for any C^∞ map $\varphi : \mathbb{T}^N \to \mathbb{R}^N$ we obtain*

(1) *the following sums:*

$$S_K(\varphi, v) = \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} P_1^{k_1} P_2^{k_2} \widehat{\varphi}_{F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v}$$

converge absolutely for any $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(2) *Assume in addition* (3.2) *holds, then*

$$|S_K(\varphi, v)| \le C_{a,y^{\pm 1}} \|\varphi\|_a \|v\|^{-a+\kappa_{P,F}}$$

for any $a > \kappa_{P,F} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(N+1)}{\tau} y$.

(3) *If the assumptions of* (2) *are satisfied for every* $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, *then the function*

$$S(\varphi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{v\in\mathbb{Z}^N} S_{K(v)}(\varphi, v) e_v$$

is a C^∞ *map if* φ *is. Moreover, the following norm comparison holds:*

$$\|S(\varphi)\|_{C^r} \le C_{r,y^{\pm 1}} \|\varphi\|_{r+\sigma}$$

for any $r \ge 0$ *and* $\sigma > N + 2 + [\kappa_{P,F}]$.

Proof. Since

$$\sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} \|P_1^{k_1} P_2^{k_2} \widehat{\varphi}_{F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v}\|$$
$$\le C_{P,F} \max_{\delta=1,2}\{\|P_1^{\delta}\|^{|k_1|}\} \max_{\delta=1,2}\{\|P_2^{\delta}\|^{|k_2|}\} \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} \|\widehat{\varphi}_{F_1^{k_1} F_2^{k_2} v}\|,$$

we get the conclusion immediately. □

In the subsequent part we prove the exponential growth along individual orbits of ergodic elements. It may be viewed as a generalization of Lemma 4.3 in [2] to higher rank non-abelian actions by toral automorphisms. Recall A and B are defined in (7) of Section 2.2.

Lemma 3.4. *There exist constant* $C > 0$ *such that for every non-zero integer vector* $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ *and for any* $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \backslash 0$,

$$\|A^{k_1} B^{k_2} v\| \ge C \exp\{\tau(|k_1| + |k_2|)\} \|v\|^{-N}. \tag{3.3}$$

Proof. Let $S = \{A^{k_1} B^{k_2} : (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2\}$. Proposition 2.5 shows that the space $\mathbb{R}^N$ is decomposed into a direct sum of S-invariant Lyapunov spaces:

$$\mathbb{R}^d = \bigoplus_{i\in I} \mathbb{M}_i. \tag{3.4}$$

where $I \subset \{1, \cdots, N\}$; and the Lyapunov exponents of $A^{k_1} B^{k_2}$ are

$$\chi_i(k) = k_1 \chi_{A,i} + k_2 \chi_{B,i}, \qquad i \in I$$

where $k = (k_1, k_2)$ and $\chi_{A,i}$ and $\chi_{B,i}$ are Lyapunov exponents of A and B on $\mathbb{M}_i$ respectively.

Let $f(t) := \max_i \chi_i(t)$, $t \in S^1$. Then $f(t)$ is continuous and achieves its minimum on S^1 at some point t_0. Next, we will show that $f(t_0) > 0$.

If $f(t_0) \leq 0$ then for all $i \in I$ we have $\chi_i(t) \leq 0$. Since $\sum_{i\in I} \chi_i(t) = 0$ for all t, it follows that $\chi_i(t) = 0$ for all $i \in I$ and consequently $f(t_0) = 0$. This implies existence of a line l in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that for all points on l χ_i, $i \in I$ take value zero. Then the line l cannot contain any non-zero integer vectors $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ otherwise all Lyapunov exponents of $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ are 0, which contradicts the ergodiccity of $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ (see Remark 2.6). Then for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ has all its eigenvalues ϵ-close to 1. Since the trace must be integers, it is equal to N. This implies all eigenvalues of $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ are 1, which also contradicts the ergodicity of $A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$. Therefore, $f(t_0) > 0$.

Choose $(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that the Lyapunov space decomposition of $s = A^{k_1}B^{k_2}$ coincide with (3.4). Let the minimal polynomial of s on $\mathbb{R}^N$ be p. Then $p = \prod_j p_j^{m_j}$ where p_j is irreducible over $\mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, each p_j is separable and any pairwise different p_j and p_i have no common eigenvalues since otherwise these irreducible polynomials would factor over $\mathbb{Q}$, and since it is monic, by Gauss' lemma, it would factor over $\mathbb{Z}$, which is a contradiction. Then $\mathbb{R}^N$ is decomposed into a direct sum of s-invariant subspaces:

$$\mathbb{R}^N = \bigoplus_{j\in J} \mathbb{I}_j$$

where $J \subset \{1, \cdots, N\}$ and the minimal polynomial of s on each $\mathbb{I}_j$ is $p_j^{m_j}$. Then each I_j is spanned by a subset of $\mathbb{Z}^N$. Note that

For each $\mathbb{I}_j$ we have a decomposition:

$$\mathbb{I}_j = \bigoplus_{n\in J_j} \mathbb{I}'_n$$

where $J_j \subset \{1, \cdots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{I}'_n$ are Lyapunov spaces of s on $\mathbb{I}_j$. Note that $\sharp(J_j) \geq 2$ for each $j \in J$ by ergodicity of s.

For any j_i, $j \in J$ we note that $s\mid_{\mathbb{I}'_{j_i}}$ and $s\mid_{\bigoplus_{n\in J_j-\{j_i\}}\mathbb{I}'_n}$ have no common eigenvalues, and also $(\bigoplus_{n\in J_j-\{j_i\}} \mathbb{I}'_n)\bigcap \mathbb{Z}^N = \{0\}$ because of irreducibility of p_j. This shows $(\bigoplus_{j\in J}\bigoplus_{n\in J_j-\{j_i\}}\mathbb{I}'_n)\bigcap \mathbb{Z}^N = \{0\}$.

For any $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ let $v(i)$ be a projection of v to $\mathbb{M}_i$, $i \in I$. For each $\mathbb{M}_i$, $i \in I$ note that

$$\mathbb{M}_i = \bigoplus_{j_i\in J_j} \mathbb{I}_{j_i}\bigcap \mathbb{M}_i$$

Then by Katznelsons lemma [9, Lemma 3], there exists a constant γ_i such that

$$\|v(i)\| \geq d(v, \bigoplus_{j\in J}\bigoplus_{n\in J_j-\{j_i\}} \mathbb{I}'_n) \geq \gamma_i \|v\|^{-N}, \tag{3.5}$$

where d is the Euclidean distance and the constant γ_i depends only on the Lyapunov spaces splitting (3.4) for S.

Using decomposition (3.4) there exists a basis under which A and B have decompositions:

$$A = px_1x_2p^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad B = y_1y_2 \tag{3.6}$$

where x_i, $y_i, p \in SL(N,\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, 2$ which satisfy:

(1) y_1 and x_1 are diagonal and y_2 and x_2 are unipotent;

(2) x_i, y_i, p $(i = 1, 2)$ preserve decomposition (3.4); and $y_1y_2 = y_2y_1$, $x_1x_2 = x_2x_1$. Furthermore,

$$C_{A,B}^{-1}\|g\| \leq \|z_1^m g z_1^{-m}\| \leq C_{A,B}\|g\|, \qquad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, \tag{3.7}$$

where z stands for x_1 and y_1 and g is any matrix preserving decomposition (3.4).

Then for any $u \in \mathbb{M}_i$, $i \in I$, any $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have

$$\|A^{k_1}B^{k_2}u\| \geq C\exp\{\chi_i(k_1,k_2)\}(|k_1|+1)^{-N}(|k_2|+1)^{-N}\|u\|.$$

By previous argument there exists $i \in I$ such that

$$\chi_i(k_1,k_2) \geq Cf(t_0)(|k_1|+|k_2|).$$

Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\|A^{k_1}B^{k_2}v\| &\geq C\|A^{k_1}B^{k_2}v(i)\| \geq C\exp\{\tau(|k_1|+|k_2|)\}\|v(i)\|^{-N}\\ &\geq C\exp\{\tau(|k_1|+|k_2|)\}\|v\|^{-N}\end{aligned}$$

where $\tau = \frac{Cf(t_0)}{2}$. Hence we proved (3.3). □

At the end of this part, we obtain crucial estimates for the polynomial growth along individual orbits of the dual action of non-ergodic elements. We also get tame estimates of C^r or Sobolev norms of functions or maps similar to that defined in Lemma 3.1 or Corollary 2.10.

Lemma 3.5. *Let F and Q be integer matrices in $GL(n,\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose F is ergodic and Q is unipotent such that $FQ = QF$. Then:*

(1) *there exists a constant $C(F,Q) > 0$ such that for every integer vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $Qv \neq v$ and for any $(k_1,k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,*

$$\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| \geq C\rho^{|k_1|}|k_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|^{-n_1}$$

where $n_1 = (2n+3)n$ and $\rho > 1$ is the growth rate in the hyperbolic direction corresponding to F.

(2) *For any C^∞ function φ on the torus, any vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $Qv \neq v$, any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and a polynomial p_1 the following sums:*

$$S_K(\varphi, v) = \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} y^{k_1}p_1(|k_2|)\widehat{\varphi}_{F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v}$$

converge absolutely for any $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(3) *Assume in addition that for any vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and for every $k = (k_1, k_2) \in K = K(v) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have $p(|k_1|)\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| \geq \|v\|$ where p is a polynomial, then*

$$|S_K(\varphi, v)| \leq C_{a,y}\|\varphi\|_a \|v\|^{-a+\kappa}$$

for any $a > \kappa_{F,Q} = (n_1+1)(4+4deg(p_1)+|\log_\rho|y||)$.

Proof. **Proof of** (1): Since Q is unipotent, there exists $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(F-I)^{j_0} = 0$ while $(F-I)^{j_0-1} \neq 0$. There also exists an integer matrix P such that $J = P^{-1}QP$ has its Jordan normal form. Then for every vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^n \backslash 0$, we can write $u = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j} u_i$ where $j \leq j_0 - 1$, such that $u_j \neq 0$; and if $u_i \neq 0$ then $(Q-I)^{i+1}u_i = 0$, while $(Q-I)^i u_i \neq 0$. Furthermore, if $u \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ then $\det(P) \cdot u_i \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. By using power form of a Jordan block, it is easy to see that

$$\|(Q^m u)_{j-1}\| \geq C_Q(|m|\|u_j\| - \|u_{j-1}\|), \qquad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}. \tag{3.8}$$

Since $Qv \neq v$, we can write $v = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} v_i$, $k \geq 1$. Let $v' = \det(P) \cdot v_k$. Above analysis shows that $v' \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. From Remark 3.2 it follows that

$$\min\{\|\pi_1(v')\|, \|\pi_3(v')\|\} \geq \gamma\|v'\|^{-n}$$

for some γ and for all v'. Therefore

$$\min\{\|\pi_1(v_k)\|, \|\pi_3(v_k)\|\} \geq \gamma|\det(P)|^{-1}\|v'\|^{-n} \geq \gamma'\|v\|^{-n}.$$

where γ' is a constant only dependent on F and Q. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| &\geq C_F\rho^{|k_1|}\min\{\|\pi_1(Q^{k_2}v)\|, \|\pi_3(Q^{k_2}v)\|\} \\
&\overset{(1)}{\geq} C_F\rho^{|k_1|}\min\{\|(Q^{k_2}\pi_1(v))_{k-1}\|, \|(Q^{k_2}\pi_3(v))_{k-1}\|\} \\
&\geq C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}\min_{\delta=1,3}\{|k_2| \cdot \|(\pi_\delta(v))_k\| - \|(\pi_\delta(v))_{k-1}\|\} \\
&\overset{(2)}{=} C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}\min_{\delta=1,3}\{|k_2| \cdot \|\pi_\delta(v_k)\| - \|\pi_\delta(v_{k-1})\|\} \\
&\geq C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}(\gamma'\|v\|^{-n} \cdot |k_2| - \|v\|).
\end{aligned}$$

Here (1) and (2) follow from the fact that F and Q commute.

Then it follows that if $|k_2| \geq 4\max\{1, \gamma'^{-2}\}\|v\|^{2(n+1)}$, then

$$\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| \geq C_{F,Q}|k_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_2|}\|v\|^{-n}. \tag{3.9}$$

If $|k_2| < 4\max\{1, \gamma'^{-2}\}\|v\|^{2(n+1)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| &\geq C_F\rho^{|k_1|}\min\{Q^{k_2}\|\pi_1(v)\|, Q^{k_2}\|\pi_3(v)\|\} \\
&\geq C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}|k_2|^{-n}\min\{\|\pi_1(v)\|, \|\pi_3(v)\|\} \\
&\geq C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}|k_2|^{-n}\|v\|^{-n} \\
&\geq C_{F,Q}\rho^{|k_1|}\|v\|^{-n_1}. \qquad (3.10)
\end{aligned}$$

Combine (3.9) and (3.10) we get the conclusion.

Proof of (2): The claim follows from the estimate in (1) and the fast decay of Fourier coefficients:

$$|S_K| \le C_{p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} |y|^{k_1}|k_2|^{\deg(p_1)}\|Q^{k_1}F^{k_2}v\|^{-a}$$

$$\le C_{a,p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{k\in K} |y|^{k_1}\rho^{-a|k_1|}|k_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}a+\deg(p_1)}\|v\|^{an_1}. \tag{3.11}$$

The last sum clearly converges providing $a > \max\{|\log_\rho|y||,\, 2(1+\deg(p_1))\}$ and for a C^∞ function φ we can choose a as large as needed.

Proof of (3): From estimate in (1) we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| &\ge C|k_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_1|}\|v\|^{-n_1}\\ &= \begin{cases} C|k_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_1|-\tau_0}(\rho^{\tau_0}\|v\|^{-n_1}) \\ C|k_2k_0^{-1}|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_1|}(|k_0|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|v\|^{-n_1}) \end{cases}\\ &\ge \begin{cases} C|k_2|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_1|-\tau_0}\|v\| \quad (*) \\ C|k_2k_0^{-1}|^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho^{|k_1|}\|v\| \quad (**) \end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

providing $|k_1| \ge \tau_0 = [(n_1+1)\log_\rho\|v\|] + 1$ or $|k_2| \ge k_0 = [\|v\|^{2(n_1+1)}] + 1$.

$$|S_K| \le \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|\ge\tau_0\}} + \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_2|\ge k_0^2\}} + \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|<\tau_0,\,|k_2|<k_0^2\}}$$

To estimate the first sum we use $(*)$ of (3.12):

$$\begin{aligned}&|S_{\{k\in K:|k_1|\ge\tau_0\}}|\\ &\le C_{p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|\ge\tau_0\}} |y|^{k_1}|k_2|^{\deg(p_1)}\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_{a,p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|\ge\tau_0\}} |y|^{k_1}|k_2|^{-\frac{1}{2}a+\deg(p_1)}\rho^{-a(|k_1|-\tau_0)}\|v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_{a,p_1}\max\{|y|,|y|^{-1}\}^{\tau_0}\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_{a,|y|,|y|^{-1}}\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\kappa}\end{aligned}$$

for any $a > \kappa = \max\{(n_1+1)|\log_\rho|y||,\, 2(1+\deg(p_1))\}$.

To estimate the second sum we use $(**)$ of (3.12):

$$\begin{aligned}&|S_{\{k\in K:|k_2|\ge k_0^2\}}|\\ &\le C_{p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_2|\ge k_0^2\}} |y|^{k_1}|k_2|^{\deg(p_1)}\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_{a,p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_2|\ge k_0^2\}} |y|^{k_1}\rho^{-a|k_1|}|k_2|^{\deg(p_1)}|k_2k_0^{-1}|^{-\frac{1}{2}a}\|v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_a|k_2|^{-\frac{1}{4}a+\deg(p_1)}\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a}\\ &\le C_a\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a}\end{aligned}$$

for any $a > \max\{4(1+\deg(p_1)),\ |\log_\rho|y||\}$.

To estimate the third sum we use the additional assumption:

$$\begin{aligned}
&|S_{\{k\in K: k_1<\tau_0, |k_2|\le k_0^2\}}| \\
&\le C_{p_1}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|<\tau_0,\,|k_2|\le k_0^2\}} |y|^{k_1}|k_2|^{\deg(p_1)}\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\|^{-a} \\
&\le C_{a,p_1}k_0^{2+2\deg(p_1)}\max\{|y|,\,|y|^{-1}\}^{\tau_0}\|\varphi\|_a \sum_{\{k\in K:|k_1|<\tau_0\}} p(|k_1|)^a\|v\|^{-a} \\
&\le C_a k_0^{2+2\deg(p_1)}\tau_0\max\{|y|,\,|y|^{-1}\}^{\tau_0}\tau_0^{a\deg(p)}\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a} \\
&\le C_{a,\delta}\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\kappa_1+\delta}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta > 0$ and any

$$a > \kappa_1 = (n_1+1)(4+4\deg(p_1)+|\log_\rho|y||).$$

By combining the estimates obtained above we get the conclusion. □

The next result follows immediately from Lemma 3.5:

Corollary 3.6. *Let F and Q be integer matrices in $GL(n,\mathbb{Z})$. Suppose F is ergodic and Q is unipotent such that $FQ = QF$. Then:*

(1) *For any C^∞ map φ on the torus, any vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ satisfying $Qv \neq v$, any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ and a polynomial p_1 the following sums:*

$$S_K(\varphi, v)(F,Q) = \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} F^{-(k_1+1)}Q^{-(k_2+1)}\widehat{\varphi}_{F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v}$$

converge absolutely for any $K \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$.

(2) *Assume in addition that for any vector $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$ and for every $k = (k_1,k_2) \in K = K(v) \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ we have $p(|k_1|)\|F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v\| \ge \|v\|$ where p is a polynomial, then*

$$\|S_K(\varphi,v)(F,Q)\| \le C_a\|\varphi\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\kappa}$$

for any $a > \kappa_{F,Q} = (n_1+1)(4+4n+|\log_\rho|y||)$, where $n_1 = (2n+3)n$, $\rho > 1$ is the growth rate in the hyperbolic direction corresponding to F and $y = \max\{\|F\|, \|F^{-1}\|\}$.

Proof. Since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K} \|F^{-(k_1+1)}Q^{-(k_2+1)}\widehat{\varphi}_{F^{|k_1|+1}Q^{k_2}v}\| \\
&\le C_{F,Q}\max\{\|F\|,\|F^{-1}\|\}^{k_1}(|k_2|+1)^n \sum_{k=(k_1,k_2)\in K}\|\widehat{\varphi}_{F^{k_1}Q^{k_2}v}\|
\end{aligned}$$

the conclusion follows immediately from Lemma 3.5. Here we used the fact that Q has polynomial increasing speed, i.e., $\|Q^{k_2}\| \le C_Q(|k_2|+1)^n$ for any $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. □

3.1. **Twisted coboundary equation of a map over automorphism on torus.** Obstructions to solving a one-cohomology equation for a function over an ergodic toral automorphism in C^∞ category are sums of Fourier coefficients of the given function along a dual orbit of the automorphism. This is the content of the Lemma 4.2 in [2]. The same characterization holds however for one-cohomology equation for a map over ergodic toral automorphisms as well due to the estimate in Corollary 3.3. The proofs of the two lemmas below follow closely the proof of Lemma 4.2 in [2] for solving a one-cohomology equation for functions. Details of the proofs can be found in [14].

Lemma 3.7. *Let P and Q are integer matrices in $GL(N,\mathbb{Z})$ and Q is ergodic. For a map θ on $\mathbb{T}^N$, if there exists a C^∞ map ω which is C^0 small enough on $\mathbb{T}^N$ such that*

$$P\omega - \omega \circ Q = \theta, \tag{3.13}$$

then the following sums along all nonzero dual orbits are zero, i.e.,

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} P^{-(i+1)}\hat{\theta}_{Q^i v} = 0, \qquad \forall v \neq 0.$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let P and Q be ergodic integer matrices in $SL(N,\mathbb{Z})$. Let θ be a C^∞ map on the torus which is C^σ small enough, where $\sigma > N + 2 + \kappa_{P,Q}$ ($\kappa_{P,Q}$ is defined in (2) of Corollary 3.3). If for all nonzero $v \in \mathbb{Z}^N$, the following sums along the dual orbits are zero, i.e.,*

$$\sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} P^{-(i+1)}\widehat{\theta}_{Q^i v} = 0, \qquad \forall v \neq 0.$$

Then the equation

$$P\omega - \omega \circ Q = \theta \tag{3.14}$$

has a C^∞ solution ω, and the following estimate:

$$\|\omega\|_a \leq C_a \|\theta\|_{a+\sigma_1}, \qquad \forall a \geq 0.$$

where $\sigma_1 > \kappa_{P,Q}$.

4. Construction of the projection for action α when $\mathcal{H}$ is nilpotent

Set $c = \max\{\|B\|, \|B^{-1}\|\}$ and $l > [\max\{N_1(c), N_2(c)\}] + 1$ where $N_1(c)$ and $N_2(c)$ are defined in Lemma 2.9 and Corollary 2.10 respectively. Let $\mathcal{B} = B$ and $\mathcal{A} = A^l$. We will use ergodic element $\mathcal{A}$ instead of A to carry out KAM scheme.

The crucial step in proving Theorem 1.3 is Proposition 4.1. The basic idea is as follows: we can make a reduction to consider R_{g_1} map ($\mathcal{A} = \alpha(g_1)$) with $(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_v = 0$ if $v \notin E_{\mathcal{A}}$. Once only the $E_{\mathcal{A}}$-Fourier coefficients are mattered for R_{g_1}, $(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_v$ $(0 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{n})$ (see Step 3 of Section 2.2) are very small if v

are "far from" $E_{\mathcal{A}}$. Hence we can center on finite points to compute the obstruction.

In the proof of next proposition, Lemma 2.10 will be used frequently to simplify computation.

Proposition 4.1. *For the cocycle difference equation* (2.2)*, set* $\|\mathcal{L}\|_a = \max_{0\le i\le \mathfrak{n}}\{\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)\|_a\}$ *(see Step* 3 *of Section 2.2). If* $v\in E_{\mathcal{A}}(v)$*, then*

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big|\sum_j \mathcal{B}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j v}-\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}v}\Big|\\ &\le C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a|v|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.1}$$

where $\sigma > \max_{0\le i\le\mathfrak{n}}\{\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i}}\}$ *($\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i}}$ is as defined in Corollary 3.3) and* $a>(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma$

Proof. The following facts will be used frequently in the proof:

(1) condition (3.1) is satisfied for any $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i}$ and $v\in\mathbb{Z}^N\backslash 0$ on $K=\{(k_1,0),k_1\in\mathbb{Z}\}$, $0\le i\le\mathfrak{n}$ (see (2.8) and Remark 3.2).

(2) $\sum_j\|\mathcal{A}^j\widehat{f}_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i})^j v}\|<\infty$ $(0\le i\le\mathfrak{n})$ where f is a smooth map and $v\in\mathbb{Z}^N\backslash 0$ (see Corollary 3.3).

(3) if $\mathcal{A}^n v\in E_{\mathcal{A}}$, $n\ge 0$ (resp. $n\le 0$), then on $K^-=\{(k_1,0)\in\mathbb{Z}: k_1\le 0\}$ (resp. $K^+=\{(k_1,0)\in\mathbb{Z}: k_1\ge 0\}$) the condition (3.2) is satisfied for any $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i}$ and v on K^- (resp. K^+) (see Proposition 2.5).

(4) Using $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i}=\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}$, $0\le i\le\mathfrak{n}$, where $d_{\mathfrak{n}+1}=e$, equation (2.2) has following forms for the pairs $(\mathcal{A},\overline{d_i})$:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{A}R_{d_i}-R_{d_i}\circ\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}\\ &=\overline{d_i}R_{g_1}\circ\overline{d_{i+1}}-R_{g_1}\circ\overline{d_i}+\overline{d_i}AR_{d_{i+1}}+\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i);\end{aligned}\tag{4.2}$$

for $0\le i\le\mathfrak{n}$, where $R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}+1}}=0$. We will be focus on these relations.

Next, we proceed to the proof.

Step 1: Reduction to prove for the"reminder" maps.

Let $\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}=\sum_{u\in\mathbb{Z}^N}(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}})_u e_u$ where

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}})_u\overset{\text{def}}{=}\begin{cases}\displaystyle\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}\mathcal{A}^{-i}(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^i u}, & u\in E_{\mathcal{A}},\\ 0, & \text{otherwise}\end{cases}\tag{4.3}$$

for $u\neq 0$ and $(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}})_0\overset{\text{def}}{=}0$.

Application of (2) of Corollary 3.3 shows that

$$\|\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}\|_a\le C_a\|R_{g_1}\|_{a+\sigma_1},\qquad\forall a\ge 0.\tag{4.4}$$

where $\sigma_1>\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}}$.

Since $R_{g_1}-\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}$ satisfies the solvable condition in Lemma 3.8, by using Lemma 3.8 there is a C^∞ function Ω such that

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}\Omega=R_{g_1}-\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}\tag{4.5}$$

(see (9) of Section 2.2) with estimates

$$\|\Omega\|_a \le C_a\|R_{g_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{g_1}\|_{a+\sigma_1} \le C_a\|R_{g_1}\|_{a+2\sigma_1}, \quad \forall a \ge 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{R}R_x = R_x - \Delta_{\bar{x}}\Omega, \qquad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}.$$

It is easy to check that if we substitute R_x by $\mathcal{R}R_x$, for any $x \in \mathcal{H}$ then equation (2.2) is also satisfied by these "remainder" maps. This shows that we can just prove the conclusion for assuming that R_{g_1} satisfies the condition:

$$\widehat{(R_{g_1})}_u = 0, \qquad \text{if } u \notin E_{\mathcal{A}}. \tag{4.7}$$

Step 2: *Reduction to maps concentrated near* $E_{\mathcal{A}}$. In this part we want to show: if $\mathcal{A}^n u \in E_{\mathcal{A}}$ for $n \ge 1$ or $n \le -2$, then

$$|\widehat{(R_{d_i})}_u| \le C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|u\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}, \tag{4.8}$$

for any $a > (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma$, $i \le \mathfrak{n}$.

We define $\varphi_i = \sum_{u\in\mathbb{Z}^N}(\widehat{\varphi_i})_u e_u$, $0 \le i \le \mathfrak{n}$:

$$(\widehat{\varphi_i})_u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} -\sum\limits_{j\le -1} \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u}, & \mathcal{A}^n u \in E_{\mathcal{A}}, n \ge 1, \\ \sum\limits_{j\ge 0} \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u}, & \mathcal{A}^n u \in E_{\mathcal{A}}, n \le -2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{4.9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \mathcal{L}(g_1, d_i) + \overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}}. \tag{4.10}$$

(3) shows that φ_i, $0 \le i \le \mathfrak{n}$ are C^∞ maps. Furthermore, $R_{\mathfrak{n}+1} = 0$ implies:

$$\|\varphi_{\mathfrak{n}}\|_a \le C_a\|\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{a+\sigma_1}, \qquad \forall a \ge 0. \tag{4.11}$$

For each $0 \le i \le \mathfrak{n}$, by iterating (4.2) backwards with respect to $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} &-\sum_{j\le -1} \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u} + \sum_{j\le -1} \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_i}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u} \\ &= (\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u + \sum_{j\le -1} \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u} \\ &= (\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u - (\widehat{\varphi_i})_u. \end{aligned} \tag{4.12}$$

By Lemma 2.10 and (4.7) we get

$$(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u = (\widehat{\varphi_i})_u, \qquad \text{if } \mathcal{A}^n u \in E_{\mathcal{A}},\ n \ge 1.$$

By iterating (4.2) with respect to $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{j\geq 0}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u}-\sum_{j\geq 0}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_i}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u}\\
&=(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u-\sum_{j\geq 0}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j u} \qquad (4.13)\\
&=(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u-(\widehat{\varphi_i})_u.
\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.10 and (4.7), we get

$$(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u=(\widehat{\varphi_i})_u,\qquad \text{if } \mathcal{A}^n u\in E_{\mathcal{A}},\ n\leq -2.$$

Hence,

$$(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_u=(\widehat{\varphi_i})_u,\qquad \text{if } \mathcal{A}^n v\in E_{\mathcal{A}},\ n\geq 1 \text{ or } n\leq -2. \tag{4.14}$$

This shows that

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_u=\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)}_u+\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_u=\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)}_u+\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_u, \tag{4.15}$$

if $\mathcal{A}^n u\in E_{\mathcal{A}}$, $n\geq 1$ or $n\leq -2$.

Hence by using Corollary 3.3 it follows from (4.9) and (4.15) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\varphi_i\|_a&\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)+d_i\mathcal{A}\varphi_{i+1}\|_{a+\sigma}\\
&\leq C_a(\|\mathcal{L}\|_{a+\sigma}+\|\varphi_{i+1}\|_{a+\sigma})\qquad \forall a\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

This and (4.11) imply that

$$\|\varphi_i\|_a\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_{a+(\mathfrak{n}-i+1)\sigma},\qquad \forall a\geq 0, \tag{4.16}$$

for any $0\leq i\leq \mathfrak{n}$. Hence we proved (4.8).

Step 3: *Basic properties of* R_{d_i}, $0\leq i\leq \mathfrak{n}$. If $v\in E_{\mathcal{A}}$, then in (4.12) substituting u by v and using Lemma 2.10, (4.7) and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_v&=(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_i}v}-\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-1}v}\\
&\quad-\sum_{j\leq -1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&\quad-\sum_{j\leq -2}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}. \qquad (4.17)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used the relation $\overline{d_i}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-1}=\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_i}$ and (4.10).

In (4.12) substituting u by $(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v$ and using Lemma 2.10, (4.7) and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v}&=-\sum_{j\leq -1}A^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v}\\
&\quad-\sum_{j\leq -1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v}.
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.10 and (3) show that we can use Corollary 3.3 to estimate the sums:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v}\right\| &\leq C_a(\|\varphi_{i+1}\|_a+\|\mathcal{L}\|_a)\|\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m})^{-1}v\|^{-a+\sigma}\\ &\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_{a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}\|v\|^{-a+\sigma}\end{aligned}\tag{4.18}$$

for any $v\in E_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $0\leq m,\, i\leq \mathfrak{n}$. Here we used estimate (4.16) for φ_{i+1}.

Applying (4.18) and Corollary 3.3 to (4.17), we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_v-(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_i}v}\right\|\\ &\leq \|\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-1}v}\|+C_a(\|\varphi_{i+1}\|_a+\|\mathcal{L}_a\|)\|v\|^{-a+\sigma}\\ &\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_{a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}\|v\|^{-a+\sigma}.\end{aligned}\tag{4.19}$$

In (4.13) substituting u by substitute u by $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v$ and using Lemma 2.10, (4.7) and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}&=\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}\\ &\quad+\sum_{j\geq 0}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}.\end{aligned}$$

(3) shows that we can use Corollary 3.3 to estimate difference:

$$\begin{aligned}&\left|(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}-\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}\right|\\ &\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v\|^{-a+\sigma}\\ &\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\sigma}\end{aligned}$$

for any $a>\sigma$.

Note that $R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}+1}}=0$, then above inequality implies

$$\left|(\widehat{R_{d_i}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_n}v}\right|\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\sigma},\tag{4.20}$$

for any $a>\sigma$, if $v\in E_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $0\leq i,m,n\leq\mathfrak{n}$.

Step 4: *Proof of the result*

In (4.2), for any $0\leq i\leq\mathfrak{n}$ Lemma 3.7 shows that the obstructions for

$$\overline{d_i}R_{g_1}\circ\overline{d_{i+1}}-R_{g_1}\circ\overline{d_i}+\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}}+\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)$$

with respect to $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}$ vanish; therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_i}v} \overset{(1)}{=} \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_i}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&= \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&+ \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&+ \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&\overset{(2)}{=} \overline{d_i}\sum_j (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&+ \overline{d_i}\sum_j (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}\\
&+ \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j v}. \qquad (4.21)
\end{aligned}$$

Here in (1) and (2) we use the relation $\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_i} = \overline{d_i}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^j$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Especially, for $i = \mathfrak{n}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_j \overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-1}}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}v} - \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j v}\\
&= \sum_j \overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-1}}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})})_{\mathcal{A}^j v}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used $d_{\mathfrak{n}+1} = e$ and $R_{\mathfrak{n}+1} = 0$.

Then by Corollary 3.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}^{-1}}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{A^j\overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}v} - \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j v}\right|\\
&\le C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\sigma} \qquad (4.22)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $a > \sigma$.

Hence if we can prove:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\overline{d_i^{-1}}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_i}v} - \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\right|\\
&\le C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}, \qquad (4.23)
\end{aligned}$$

for each $0 \le i \le \mathfrak{n}-1$, then (4.1) follows from (4.22) and (4.23) immediately.

In (4.21) by using Lemma 2.10, (4.7) and (4.14) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_j \overline{d_i}^{-1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_i}v}\\
&=\sum_{j=0,1}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\\
&+\sum_{-1\le j\le 1}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\\
&+\sum_{j\le -2,\, j\ge 3}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\\
&+\sum_j \overline{d_i}^{-1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}.
\end{aligned}$$

By using Lemma 2.10 and (4.7) we also have

$$\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{i+1}}v}=\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\sum_{-1\le j\le 1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{i+1}}v}$$

Set

$$\begin{aligned}
J_i(v)=&\sum_{j=0,1}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\\
&+\sum_{j=0,1}(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\\
&-\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\sum_{-1\le j\le 1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\
&=\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_v+(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\
&+(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}-\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\
&-\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\mathcal{A}^{-2}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}. \qquad (4.24)
\end{aligned}$$

Then it follows from (4.16), (4.18) and Corollary 3.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left|\overline{d_i^{-1}}\sum_j\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_i}v}-\overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\sum_j\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\right|\\
&\le |J_i(v)|+\sum_{j\le -2,\, j\ge 3}\|(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-(j+1)}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\|\\
&+\sum_j\|\overline{d_i}^{-1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_i)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-1}v}\|+\|\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^jv}\|\\
&\le |J_i(v)|+C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+2)\sigma}. \qquad (4.25)
\end{aligned}$$

Then to prove (4.23) we need to estimate $|J_i(v)|$.

(4.19) has provided enough information for $(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_v$. Next, we will center on the computation of $(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}$.

For any $0 \le m \le \mathfrak{n}$, in (4.13) substituting i by m and u by $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v$ and using Lemma 2.10, (4.7) and (4.14) we get

$$\begin{aligned}(\widehat{R_{d_m}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} &= \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_m}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{m+1}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\ &\quad + \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{m+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} + \Theta(m,i,v),\end{aligned} \tag{4.26}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\Theta(m,i,v) &= \mathcal{A}^{-2}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{m+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{m+1}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\ &\quad + \sum_{j\ge 2}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}\overline{d_m}A(\widehat{\varphi_{i+1}})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{m+1}})^j\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\ &\quad + \sum_{j\ge 0}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_m)})_{(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{m+1}})^j\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v},\end{aligned} \tag{4.27}$$

and

$$|\Theta(m,i,v)| \le C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}, \quad \forall a > (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma \tag{4.28}$$

follows from (4.16), (4.20) and Corollary 2.10.

Set $\Lambda(m,i,v) = (\widehat{R_{d_m}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}(\widehat{R_{d_{m+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}$. Then it follows that

$$(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} = \Lambda(i+1,i,v) + \sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Lambda(m,i,v) \tag{4.29}$$

by noting used $R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}+1}} = 0$, where $\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}}$ is defined in (2.2) of Section 4; and we also get

$$\begin{aligned}\Lambda(m,i,v) &= \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_m}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{m+1}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\ &\quad + \Theta(m,i,v).\end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

This shows that we can express $\sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Lambda(m,i,v)$ as:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Lambda(m,i,v)\\ &= \sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\big(\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_m}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{m+1}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\ &\quad - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_m}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\big) + \sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Theta(m,i,v).\end{aligned}$$

The first sum can be simplified as:

$$d_{i+1}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+2}}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}.$$

Here we used $\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}+1}\overline{d_{j-1}}) = d_{i+1}\mathcal{A}^{-1}$. Then it follows from (4.29) and above analysis that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} &= \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+2}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + d_{i+1}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+2}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + \sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Theta(m,i,v) + \Theta(i+1,i,v)\\
&= d_{i+1}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + \sum_{m=i+2}^{\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\prod_{j=i+2}^{m}\overline{d_{j-1}})\mathcal{A}\Theta(m,i,v) + \Theta(i+1,i,v).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence it follows from (4.28) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \overline{d_{i+1}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} + \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\Big|\\
&\leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}. \qquad (4.31)
\end{aligned}$$

Then by using (4.24) we can estimate $J_i(v)$ by rewriting it as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
J_i(v) &\overset{(1)}{=} \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\big((\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_v - (\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\big)\\
&\quad + (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}\mathcal{A}\big((\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \overline{d_{i+1}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\big)\\
&\quad + \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}v} + (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad - (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad - \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\mathcal{A}^{-2}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&= \overline{d_{i+1}^{-1}}\big((\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_v - (\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^{-1}\overline{d_{i+1}}v}\big)\\
&\quad + (\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}})^{-2}\mathcal{A}\big((\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v} - \overline{d_{i+1}}\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\overline{d_{i+1}}\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}\big).
\end{aligned}$$

In (1) we used (4.19), (4.31) to substitute $(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_v$ and $(\widehat{R_{d_{i+1}}})_{\overline{\mathcal{A}d_{i+1}}v}$ respectively, which also implies:

$$|J_i(v)| \leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+2)\sigma}.$$

Then (4.23) follows from (4.25) and above computation immediately. □

Lemma 4.2. *For any $v \in E_{\mathcal{A}}$, we have*

$$\Big|\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j v}\Big| \leq C_a\|\mathcal{L}\|_a\|v\|^{-a+\kappa},$$

where $a > \kappa = (\mathfrak{n}+2)\sigma + (N+1)\tau_1^{-1}\log q$, $q = \max_{\delta_1,\delta_2=-1,0,1}\|\mathcal{B}^{\delta_1}\mathcal{A}^{\delta_2}\|$.

Proof. Let $v_{0,+} = v_{0,-} = v$ and let

$$v_{n,+} = (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{B})^n v \quad \text{and} \quad v_{n,-} = (\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathcal{B}^{-1})^n v, \quad n \geq 1.$$

(see (6) of Section 2.2) By Lemma 2.9 and the construction at beginning of Section 4, we get

$$v_{n,+} = \mathcal{A}^{\delta_n^+}\mathcal{B}v_{n-1,+} \quad \text{and} \quad v_{n,-} = \mathcal{A}^{\delta_n^-}\mathcal{B}^{-1}v_{n-1,-}$$

where $\delta_n^+, \delta_n^- \in \{-1,0,1\}$. This shows that

$$v_{n,+} = \Pi_{j=n}^1(\mathcal{A}^{\delta_j^+}\mathcal{B})v \quad \text{and} \quad v_{n,-} = \Pi_{j=n}^1(\mathcal{A}^{\delta_j^-}\mathcal{B}^{-1})v, \quad n \geq 1.$$

(see (2) of Section 2.2). We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j v_{n,\pm}} &= \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{A}^{\delta_n^\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n-1,\pm}} \\ &= \mathcal{A}^{\delta_n^\pm}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n-1,\pm}}.\end{aligned}$$

since all the sums involved converge absolutely by (1) of Corollary 3.3.

Let $\mathcal{E}_n^\pm = \prod_{i=1}^n(\mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\mathcal{A}^{-\delta_i^\pm})$, then formally we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{A^j v} - \lim_{n\to\infty}\mathcal{E}_n^\pm\mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n,\pm}} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{v,\pm} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{A^j v} - \sum_j \mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v} \\ &+ \sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathcal{E}_n^\pm\Big(\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{A^j v_{n,\pm}} - \mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n,\pm}}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

Next, we will justify the convergence of $\mathcal{D}_{v,+}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{v,-}$ and compute the two limits. To do so, we need to estimate the growth rate of $v_{n,\pm}$. Let $l_n^\pm = \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i^\pm$. Similar to (2.10) we can write

$$\Pi_{j=n}^1(\mathcal{A}^{\delta_j^\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}) = e_n^\pm\mathcal{A}^{l_n^\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\pm n}, \qquad \forall n > 0. \tag{4.32}$$

where $e_n^\pm \in \alpha([\mathcal{H},\mathcal{H}])$.

By (4) of Proposition 2.5

$$\|e_n^\pm\| \geq Cp(n)^{-1} \tag{4.33}$$

for a polynomial p.

Using Lemma 3.4 and above inequality, for any $u \in \mathbb{Z}^N\backslash 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|v_{n,\pm}\| = \left\|e_n^\pm(\mathcal{A}^{l_n^\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\pm n})v\right\| &\geq Ce^{\tau n}p(n)^{-1}\|v\|^{-N} \\ &\geq Ce^{\tau n/2}\|v\|^{-N}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

Then apply Proposition 4.1 and (4.34), we have

$$\begin{aligned}(4.35)\quad \|\mathcal{D}_{v,\pm}\| &\le C_a \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} q^n \|\mathcal{L}\|_a \|v_{n,\pm}\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\ &\le C_a \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} q^n \|\mathcal{L}\|_a (C\exp\{\tau n/2\}\|v\|^{-N})^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\ &\le C_a \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} q^n \|\mathcal{L}\|_a \exp\{-\tau n(a-(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma)/2\}\|v\|^{N(a-(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma)} \\ &< \infty\end{aligned}$$

if $a > \frac{2\log q}{\tau} + (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma$, where $q = \max_{\delta_1,\delta_2=-1,0,1} \|\mathcal{B}^{\delta_1}\mathcal{A}^{\delta_2}\|$.

To estimate the limit we use (2) of Corollary 3.3 and (4.34). The two conditions are satisfied (see the beginning of the proof of Proposition 4.1). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\Big\|\mathcal{E}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n,\pm}}\Big\| \\ &\le Cq^n\Big\|\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n,\pm}}\Big\| \\ &\le C_a q^n \|\widehat{R_{g_1}}\|_a \|\mathcal{B}v_{n,\pm}\|^{-a+\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}}+1} \\ &\le C_a q^n \|\widehat{R_{g_1}}\|_a \exp\{-\tau|n|(a-\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}}-1)/2\}\|v\|^{N(a-\kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}}-1)}\end{aligned}$$

for any $a > \frac{2\log q}{\tau} + \kappa_{\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}} + 1$.

Then it follows that the limit

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{E}_n^{\pm}\mathcal{B}^{\mp 1}\sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{\mathcal{A}^j\mathcal{B}^{\pm 1}v_{n,\pm}} = 0.$$

Hence the obstruction has two expressions:

$$(4.36)\qquad \sum_j \mathcal{A}^{-(j+1)}(\widehat{R_{g_1}})_{A^j v} = \mathcal{D}_{v,+} = \mathcal{D}_{v,-}.$$

We estimate the obstruction using both of its forms in order to obtain needed estimates.

Next, we will estimate the lower bound of the increasing speed of $v_{n,\pm}$ in terms of $\|v\|$ instead of $\|v\|^{-N}$. (4.32) allows us to estimate growth rate of $(\mathcal{A}^{l_n^{\pm}}\mathcal{B}^{\pm n})v$ instead.

For any $v = \mathcal{M}(v)$, in case $\mathcal{A}v \hookrightarrow 2(\mathcal{A})$, let v_1 be the projection of v to the 0-Lyapunov space J' for $\mathcal{A}$. Then

$$\|v_1\| \ge C\|v\|.$$

Let the Lyapunov exponent of $\mathcal{B}$ on this Lyapunov space be ν. For all $k = (k_1,k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the Lyapunov exponent of $\mathcal{A}^{k_1}\mathcal{B}^{k_2}$ on J' is $k_2\nu$ (see Proposition 2.5). Then if $\nu \ge 0$, on the half-space $K_v^+ = \{k_1,k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : k_2 \ge 0\}$ we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{k_1}\mathcal{B}^{k_2}v\| \ge C(|k_1|+1)^{-N}(|k_2|+1)^{-N}\|v_1\| \ge C(|k_1k_2|+1)^{-N}\|v\|$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{k_1}\mathcal{B}^{k_2}v\| \geq C(|k_1|+1)^{-N}e^{k_2\nu/2}\|v_1\| \geq C(|k_1k_2|+1)^{-N}\|v\|$$

on $K_v^- = \{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : k_2 \leq 0\}$ if $\nu < 0$.

In case $\mathcal{A}v \hookrightarrow 1(\mathcal{A})$, let v_1 and v_2 be the largest projections of v to some Lyapunov space J_1 and J_2 with positive Lyapunov exponent λ_1 and negative Lyapunov exponent λ_2 respectively. Let ν_1 and ν_2 be corresponding Lyapunov exponents of $\mathcal{B}$ on the two Lyapunov spaces. Then

$$\|v_1\| \geq C\|v\|, \qquad \|v_2\| \geq C\|v\|.$$

For all $k = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the Lyapunov exponent of $\mathcal{A}^{k_1}\mathcal{B}^{k_2}$ on J_1 is $\chi(k_1,k_2)^+ = k_1\lambda_1 + k_2\nu_1$ and is $\chi(k_1,k_2)^- = k_2\lambda_2 + k_2\nu_2$ on J_2. We want to obtain:

$$\{(k_1,k_2) : \chi(k_1,k_2)^+ \geq 0\} \bigcup \{(k_1,k_2) : \chi(k_1,k_2)^- \geq 0\} \tag{4.37}$$

covers either K_v^+ or K_v^-, which boils down to require $k_2(\frac{\nu_1}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\lambda_2}) \geq 0$. Namely, for any $(k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, (k_1, k_2) belongs to the union in (4.37) if $k_2(\frac{\nu_1}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\lambda_2}) \geq 0$ and this is true for $k_2 \geq 0$ or for $k_2 \leq 0$ depending on the sign of $\frac{\nu_1}{\lambda_1} - \frac{\nu_2}{\lambda_2}$. Therefore we obtain

$$\|\mathcal{A}^{k_1}\mathcal{B}^{k_2}v\| \geq C(|k_1|+1)^{-N}(|k_2|+1)^{-N}\|v\|. \tag{4.38}$$

in K_v^+ or in K_v^-.

The above analysis shows that for any $v = \mathcal{M}(v)$, we can choose $\mathrm{sgn}(v) \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that (4.38) holds on $K_v^{\mathrm{sgn}(v)}$. Using (4.32), (4.33) and (4.38) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \|v_{n,\mathrm{sgn}(v)}\| &= \left\| e_n^{\mathrm{sgn}(v)} \mathcal{A}^{l_n^{\mathrm{sgn}(v)}} \mathcal{B}^{\mathrm{sgn}(v)n} v \right\| \\ &\geq C(n^2+1)^{-N} p(n)^{-1} \|v\| \end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

on $K_v^{\mathrm{sgn}(v)}$. From (4.35) we get

$$\|\mathcal{D}_{v,\mathrm{sgn}(v)}\| \leq C_a \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} q^n \|\mathcal{L}\|_a \|v_{n,\mathrm{sgn}(v)}\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \tag{4.40}$$

if $a > (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma$.

From (4.36), (4.34), (4.39) and (4.40) we see that the conclusion follows immediately if we can prove the following claim:
Suppose u_n, $n \geq 0$ is a sequence of vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^N \backslash 0$ such that

$$(*)\|u_n\| \geq Ce^{n\tau/2}\|u_0\|^{-N} \quad \text{and} \quad (**)\|u_n\| \geq C(n+1)^{-2N}p(n)^{-1}\|u_0\|.$$

Then for any $a > \max\{(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma, (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma + \frac{2}{\tau}\log q\}$

$$\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n \|u_n\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \leq C_{a,\delta}\|u_0\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma+\delta}$$

for any $\delta > 0$.

Proof of the claim. Let $\tau_1 = \frac{\tau}{2}$ and $n_0 = [\frac{(N+1)}{\tau_1}\log\|u_0\|] + 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n\geq 0} q^n \|u_n\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&= \sum_{n\geq n_0+1} q^n \|u_n\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} + \sum_{n\leq n_0} q^n \|u_n\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&\overset{(1)}{\leq} C_a \sum_{n\geq n_0+1} q^n (e^{\tau_1 n}\|u_0\|^{-N})^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&+ n_0 q^{n_0} C_a (n_0+1)^{2N} p(n_0) \|u_0\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&\leq C_a \sum_{n\geq n_0+1} q^n \big(e^{\tau_1(n-n_0)}(e^{\tau_1 n_0}\|u_0\|^{-N})\big)^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&+ C_{a,\delta}\|u_0\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma+\delta+(N+1)\tau_1^{-1}\log q} \\
&\overset{(2)}{\leq} C_a \sum_{n\geq n_0+1} q^n \big(e^{\tau_1(n-n_0)}\|u_0\|\big)^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} \\
&+ C_{a,\delta}\|u_0\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma+\delta+(N+1)\tau_1^{-1}\log q} \\
&\overset{(3)}{\leq} C_{a,\delta}\|u_0\|^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma+\delta+(N+1)\tau_1^{-1}\log q}
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\delta > 0$ providing $a > \max\{(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma, (\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma + (N+1)\tau_1^{-1}\log q\}$.

Here in (1) to estimate $\sum_{n\geq n_0+1}$ we use the exponential increasing estimate $(*)$ and for $\sum_{n\leq n_0}$ the we use the lower bound in $(**)$. In (2) we rewrite

$$q^n(e^{\tau_1(n-n_0)}\|u_0\|)^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma} = q^{n_0}\big(e^{(n-n_0)(\tau_1 - \frac{\log q}{a-(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma})}\|u_0\|\big)^{-a+(\mathfrak{n}+1)\sigma}$$

and note that polynomials increase slower than any exponential functions, then (3) follows immediately. □

Proposition 4.3. *Fix $\sigma = N+3+\kappa$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any C^∞ maps θ, ψ, ω on $\mathbb{T}^N$ that are C^σ small enough, it is possible to split R_{g_1}, R_{d_i}, $0 \leq d \leq \mathfrak{n}$ as*

$$R_{g_1} = \Delta_{\mathcal{A}}\Omega + \mathcal{R}R_{g_1}, \qquad R_{d_i} = \Delta_{\overline{d_i}}\Omega + \mathcal{R}R_{d_i}$$

for a C^∞ map Ω, so that

$$\|\Omega\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_0}, \cdots, R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}\|_{C^{r+\sigma}}$$

and

$$\|\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}, \mathcal{R}R_{d_0}, \cdots, \mathcal{R}R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_0), \cdots, \mathcal{L}(g_1, d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+\sigma+()\sigma_1}}$$

for any $r \geq 0$.

Proof. $\mathcal{R}\theta$ and Ω are constructed in (4.3) and (4.5) respectively. The C^r estimate for Ω follow immediately from (4.6) and (8) of Section 2.2; and C^r

estimate for $\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}$ are from Lemma 4.2 and (8) of Section 2.2 we get

$$\|\mathcal{R}R_{g_1}\|_{C^r} \leq C_r\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_0),\cdots,\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+\sigma}}$$

for any $r \geq 0$.

Let

$$\mathcal{R}R_{d_i} = R_{d_i} - \Delta_{\overline{d_i}}\Omega, \qquad 0 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{n}.$$

It is easy to check that if we substitute R_{d_i} by $\mathcal{R}R_{d_i}$ (4.2) still holds. In (4.2) letting $i = \mathfrak{n}$, we get

$$\mathcal{A}\mathcal{R}R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}}} - \mathcal{R}R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}}} \circ \mathcal{A} = \overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}\mathcal{R}R_{g_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}} + \mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}}).$$

Then the following estimate holds

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{R}R_{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}\|_{C^r} &\leq C_r\|\overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}}\mathcal{R}R_{g_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{\mathfrak{n}}} + \mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+\sigma}}\\ &\leq C_r\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_0),\cdots,\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+2\sigma}}\end{aligned}$$

for any $r \geq 0$.

Now we proceed by induction. Fix i between $\mathfrak{n}$ and 0 and assume that for all $j \geq i$

$$\|\mathcal{R}R_{d_j}\|_{C^r} \leq C_r\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_0),\cdots,\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+(\mathfrak{n}-j+2)\sigma}}$$

for any $r \geq 0$.

By using (4.2) for $i-1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\|\mathcal{R}R_{d_{i-1}}\|_{C^r}\\ &\leq C_r\|\overline{d_{i-1}}\mathcal{R}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_i} - \mathcal{R}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{i-1}} + \overline{d_{i-1}}A\mathcal{R}R_{d_i} + \mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{i-1})\|_{C^{r+\sigma}}\\ &\leq C_r\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_0),\cdots,\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+\sigma+(\mathfrak{n}-i+2)\sigma}}\\ &= C_r\|\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_0),\cdots,\mathcal{L}(g_1,d_{\mathfrak{n}})\|_{C^{r+(\mathfrak{n}-(i-1)+2)\sigma}}\end{aligned}$$

for any $r \geq 0$.

Then we get the estimate for the case of $i-1$. Hence we obtain the estimates for all $\mathcal{R}R_{d_i}$, $0 \leq i \leq \mathfrak{n}$.

□

5. Construction of the projection for action α when $\mathcal{H}$ is not nilpotent

Proposition 5.1. *Fix $\sigma = N+3+\kappa$. There exists $\delta > 0$ such that for any C^∞ maps θ, ψ, ω on $\mathbb{T}^N$ that are C^σ small enough, it is possible to split R_{A_i}, $1 \leq i \leq 4$ as $R_{A_i} = \Delta_{A_i}\Omega + \mathcal{R}R_{A_i}$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$ for a C^∞ map Ω, so that*

$$\|\Omega\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \max_{1\leq i\leq 4}\|R_{A_i}\|_{C^{r+\sigma}}, \quad \forall\, r \geq 0$$

and

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq 4}\|\mathcal{R}R_{A_i}\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \max_{2\leq i\leq 4}\|\mathcal{L}(A_1,A_i)\|_{C^{r+\sigma+()\sigma_1}}, \quad \forall\, r \geq 0.$$

Proof. Similar to (4.3) we define $\mathcal{R}R_{A_1} = \sum_{v\in\mathbb{Z}^N}(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_v e_v$ where

$$(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_v = \begin{cases} \sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} A^{-i}(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A^i v}, & v = \mathcal{M}_{A_1}(v), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for $v \neq 0$ and $(\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_0 = 0$.

Since $R_{A_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{A_1}$ satisfies the solvable condition in Lemma 3.8, by using Lemma 3.8 there is a C^∞ function Ω such that

$$\Delta_A \Omega = R_{A_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{A_1}$$

with estimates

$$\|\Omega\|_a \leq C_a \|R_{A_1} - \mathcal{R}R_{A_1}\|_{a+\sigma_1} \leq C_a \|R_{A_1}\|_{a+2\sigma_1}, \quad \forall a \geq 0.$$

where $\sigma_1 > \kappa_{A,A}$.

Since

$$A_1 R_{A_i} - R_{A_i} \circ A_1 = A_i R_{A_1} - R_{A_1} \circ A_i + \mathcal{L}_i \tag{5.1}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n$, the obstructions for each side with respect to A_1 vanish; therefore for any $v = \mathcal{M}_{A_1}(v)$ we have

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-(j+1)} A_i (\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A_1^j v} - \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-(j+1)} (\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A_1^j A_i v} = -\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-(j+1)} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{A_1^j v}.$$

The absolutely convergence of all sums evolved is guaranteed by (1) of Corollary 3.3.

Recall nations above Theorem 1.4. Since $\bigcap_{i=2}^n p_1(A_i) = \{0\}$, $\bigoplus_{i=2}^n p_1(A_i)^\perp = \mathbb{R}^N$. Let P_i, $2 \leq i \leq n$ be the projection to $p_1(A_i)^\perp$. For any $v \in E_{A_1}$, there exists $2 \leq i_0 \leq n$ such that $\|P_{i_0}(v)\| \geq C\|v\|$.

Iterating this equation with respect to A_{i_0} we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-j} (\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A_1^j v} - \sum_{l\to\infty} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-j} A_{i_0}^{-l} (\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A_1^j A_{i_0}^l v} \\ &= -\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_{i_0}^{-(l+1)} A_1^{-(j+1)} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}_i})_{A_1^j A_{i_0}^l v}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_{i_0} v \neq v$, it follows from (1) of Corollary 3.6 that all the involving sums are convergent absolutely, which also implies that the limit above is 0. By iterating backwards and applying the same reasoning, in the notation of Corollary 3.6 we obtain

$$\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} A_1^{-j} (\widehat{\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}})_{A_1^j u} = -S_{K^+}(\mathcal{L}_i, u)(A_1, A_{i_0}) = S_{K^-}(\mathcal{L}_i, u)(A_1, A_{i_0}), \tag{5.2}$$

where $K^+ = \{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : k_2 \geq 0\}$ and $K^- = \{k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : k_2 < 0\}$.

Then according to (2) of Corollary 3.6, the needed estimate for $\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}$ with respect to $\mathcal{L}$ follows if in at least on one of the half-spaces K^+ and K^- the dual action satisfies some polynomial lower bound for every $u \in E_{A_1}$ (see (6) of Section 2.2).

For A_1 we have the following eigenspace decomposition:

$$\mathbb{R}^N = \bigoplus_{i\in I} J_{\mu_i}$$

where J_{μ_i} is the eigenspace of A_1 with eigenvalue μ_i. We denote by q_i the projection to each J_{μ_i}.

Since A_1 and A_{i_0} commute, A_{i_0} preserves each J_{μ_i}. We can choose a basis of $\mathbb{R}^N$ such that A_{i_0} has its Jordan normal form on each J_{μ_i}. Then for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$ we have a decomposition $u = u_1 + u_2$ determined by this basis, where $A_{i_0}u_1 = u_1$, $(A_{i_0} - I)u_2 \neq 0$ and

$$\|A_{i_0}^k q_i(u_2)\| \geq C\|q_i(u_2)\|, \qquad \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall i \in I$$

Note that for any $u \in p_1(A_{i_0})^\perp$, we have

$$\|u_2\| \geq C\|u\|.$$

Especially, we have

$$\|(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \geq C\|P_{i_0}(v)\| \geq C\|v\|.$$

In case $(P_{i_0}(v))_2 \hookrightarrow 1, 2(A_1)$, suppose $(P_{i_0}(v))_2$ has the largest projections to some Lyapunov space J_{μ_j} of A_1 with non-negative Lyapunov exponent. Then

$$\|q_j(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \geq C\|(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \geq C\|v\|,$$

and thus for any $k_1 \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1^{k_1}A_{i_0}^{k_2}v\| &\geq C\|A_1^{k_1}A_3^{k_2}v_2\| = C\|A_1^{k_1}A_3^{k_2}(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \geq C\|A_1^{k_1}A_3^{k_2}q_j(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \\ &\geq C(k_1+1)^{-N}\|A_3^{k_2}q_j(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \geq C(k_1+1)^{-N}\|q_j(P_{i_0}(v))_2\| \\ &\geq C(k_1+1)^{-N}\|v\|.\end{aligned}$$

Since $v = \mathcal{M}_{A_1}(v)$, letting v' be the largest projection of v to some Lyapunov space J_{μ_i} of A_1 with negative Lyapunov exponent μ_i, we have

$$\|v'\| \geq C\|v\|.$$

Let J be the Jorden block of A_{i_0} on J_{μ_i} on which v' has the largest projection v''. Then

$$\|v''\| \geq C\|v\|.$$

Since $(A_{i_0} - I)^2 = 0$, then J is either a 1×1 or a 2×2 matrix. In case J is a 1×1 matrix, then for any $k_1 < 0$, $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1^{k_1}A_{i_0}^{k_2}v\| &\geq C\|A_1^{k_1}A_{i_0}^{k_2}v'\| \geq Ce^{k_1\mu_i/2}\|A_{i_0}^{k_2}v'\| \geq Ce^{k_1\mu_i/2}\|A_{i_0}^{k_2}v''\| \\ &= Ce^{k_1\mu_i/2}\|v''\| \geq Ce^{k_1\mu_i/2}\|v\|.\end{aligned}$$

In case J is a 2×2 matrix, denote the coordinates of v'' by (a_1, a_2). If $a_1 a_2 \geq 0$ then for any $k_1 < 0$, $k_2 \geq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|A_1^{k_1} A_{i_0}^{k_2} v\| &\geq C e^{k_1 \mu_i/2} \|A_{i_0}^{k_2} v''\| = C e^{k_1 \mu_i/2} \|(a_1 + k_2 a_2, a_2)\| \geq C e^{k_1 \mu_i/2} \|v''\| \\ &\geq C e^{k_1 \mu_i/2} \|v\|.\end{aligned}$$

If $a_1 a_2 < 0$ then same estimate holds for any $k_1 < 0$, $k_2 > 0$. Hence

$$\|A_1^{k_1} A_{i_0}^{k_2} v\| \geq C(|k_1| + 1)^{-N} \|v\| \tag{5.3}$$

holds either on K^+ or on K^-.

In case $(P_{i_0}(v))_2 \hookrightarrow 3(A_1)$, applying the same reasoning, we see that (5.3) still holds either on K^+ or on K^-. Now choose the half-space K^+ or K^- in which the estimates (5.3) holds, i.e., choose one of the sums $S_{K^+}(\varphi, v)(A_1, A_{i_0})$ or $S_{K^-}(\varphi, v)(A_1, A_{i_0})$. Then the assumption of (2) of Corollary 3.6 is satisfied for one of the sums above and therefore the estimate for $\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}$ follows:

$$\|\mathcal{R}R_{A_1}\|_a \leq C_{a,\delta} \max_{2 \leq i \leq n} \|\mathcal{L}_i\|_{a+\kappa+\delta}, \quad \forall\, a \geq 0,\, \delta > 0$$

where $\kappa = (n_1 + 1)|\log_\rho y| + 4(n_1 + 1)(1 + N)$; here $n_1 = 2N^2 + 3N$, $y = \max\{\|A_1\|, \|A_1^{-1}\|\}$.

Let $\mathcal{R}R_{A_i} = R_{A_i} - \Delta_{A_i}\Omega$, $2 \leq i \leq n$. It is easy to check that if substituting R_{A_i} by $\mathcal{R}R_{A_i}$ equation (5.1) are also satisfied. Then it follows from Lemma 3.8 that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{R}R_{A_i}\|_a &\leq C_a \|A_i R_{A_1} - R_{A_1} \circ A_i + \mathcal{L}_i\|_{a+\kappa_{A_1,A_1}} \\ &\leq C_{a,\delta} \|\mathcal{L}_i\|_{a+\kappa_{A_1,A_1}+\kappa+\delta}.\end{aligned}$$

□

6. ERROR

The following lemma shows that $\mathcal{L}$ cannot be large if $\alpha + R$ is a nilpotent group action. It is in fact quadratically small with respect to R.

Lemma 6.1. *If $\widetilde{\alpha} = \alpha + R$ is a C^∞ nipotent group action on $\mathbb{T}^N$ then for any $r \geq 0$*

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_i)\|_{C^r} \leq\ & C_r \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_0}, \cdots, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^r} \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_0}, \cdots, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^{r+1}} \\ &+ C_r \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_0}, \cdots, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^{r+1}} \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_0}, \cdots, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^{r+2}}^2.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_\mathfrak{n}} = \overline{d_\mathfrak{n}}\mathcal{A}$, it follows from Lemma 4.7 in [2] that

$$\|\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_i)\|_{C^r} \leq C_r \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^r} \|R_{g_1}, R_{d_\mathfrak{n}}\|_{C^{r+1}}.$$

Note that $\mathcal{A}\overline{d_i} = \overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\alpha}_\mathcal{A} \circ \widetilde{\alpha}_{\overline{d_i}} &= \widetilde{\alpha}_{\overline{d_i}} \circ \widetilde{\alpha}_\mathcal{A} \circ \widetilde{\alpha}_{\overline{d_{i+1}}} \\ (\mathcal{A} + R_{g_1}) \circ (\overline{d_i} + R_{d_i}) &= (\overline{d_i} + R_{d_i}) \circ (\mathcal{A} + R_{g_1}) \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}}).\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathcal{A}R_{d_i} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_i} + R_{d_i}) = R_{d_i} \circ \left(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}} + \mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}})\right) + \overline{d_i}\mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + \overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_i)\\
&= \mathcal{A}R_{d_i} - R_{d_i} \circ \mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}} - \overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_i} - \overline{d_i}AR_{d_{i+1}}\\
&= R_{d_i} \circ \left(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}} + \mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}})\right) - R_{d_i} \circ \mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}\\
&+ \overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}}) - \overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{i+1}}\\
&+ R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_i} - R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_i} + R_{d_i}).
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate for C^r norms follows similarly (see for example [[11], Appendix II]):

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathcal{L}(g_1, d_i)\|_{C^r}\\
&\leq \left\|R_{d_i} \circ \left(\mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}} + \mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}})\right) - R_{d_i} \circ \mathcal{A}\overline{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^r}\\
&+ \left\|\overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}}) - \overline{d_i}R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^r}\\
&+ \left\|R_{g_1} \circ \overline{d_i} - R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_i} + R_{d_i})\right\|_{C^r}\\
&\leq C_r\|R_{d_i}, \mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}})\|_{C^r}\\
&\cdot \|R_{d_i}, \mathcal{A}R_{d_{i+1}} + R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}})\|_{C^{r+1}}\\
&+ C_r\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^r}\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^{r+1}}\\
&+ C_r\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_i}\right\|_{C^r}\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_i}\right\|_{C^{r+1}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combined with

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\|R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}} + R_{d_{i+1}}) - R_{g_1} \circ (\overline{d_{i+1}})\right\|_{C^r}\\
&\leq C_r\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^r}\left\|R_{g_1}, R_{d_{i+1}}\right\|_{C^{r+1}},
\end{aligned}$$

we get the conclusion immediately. □

7. Proof of

References

[1] Lan D. Brown, Representation of finitely generated nilpotent groups, *Pacific Jornal of Mathematics* Vol. 45, No.1, 1973

[2] D. Damjanovic and A. Katok, Local Rigidity of Partially Hyperbolic Actions. I. KAM method and $\mathbb{Z}^k$ actions on the torus, *Annals of Mathematics* **172** (2010), 1805–1858.

[3] D. Damjanovic and A. Katok, Local Rigidity of homogenous parabolic actions: I a model case, *Journal of morden dynamics* **172** (2011), 203–235

[4] D. Fisher, B. Kalinin and R. Spatzier, (Appendix by James F. Davis) Global rigidity of higher rank Anosov actions on tori and nilmanifolds. , Journal of the American Mathematical Society, 26 (2013), no. 1, 167-198.

[5] D. Fisher and G. Margulis, Local rigidity of affine actions of higher rank groups and lattices, *Annals of Mathematics* **170** (2009), 67-122.
[6] A. Katok and R. Spatzier, First cohomology of Anosov actions of higher rank abelian groups and applications to rigidity, *Publ. Math. IHES* **79** (1994), 131–156.
[7] A. Katok, R. Spatzier, Subelliptic estimates of polynomial differential operators and applications to rigidity of abelian actions, *Math. Res. Letters* **1** (1994), 193–202.
[8] A. Katok and R. Spatzier, Differential rigidity of Anosov actions of higher rank abelian groups and algebraic lattice actions, *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **216** (1997), 287–314.
[9] Y. Katznelson, Ergodic automorphisms of T^n are Bernoulli shifts, Israel J. Math. 10 (1971), 186C195.
[10] L. Kronecker, Zwei Sätze über Gleichungen mit ganzzahligen Coefficienten, J. Reine Angew. Math. 53 (1857).
[11] V. F. Lazutkin, KAM Theory and Semiclassical Approximations to Eigenfunctions, Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. 24, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993.
[12] R. De La Llave, A tutorial on KAM theory, in Smooth Ergodic Theory and its Applications (Seattle, WA, 1999), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 69, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2001, pp. 175-292.
[13] A. N. Starkov, The first cohomology group, mixing, and minimal sets of the commutative group of algebraic actions on a torus, J. Math. Sci. .New York/ 95 (1999), 2576C2582.
[14] Heisenberg group actions and non-chaotic properties of central element actions

Department of Mathematics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA

E-mail address: wangzq@math.msu.edu